Chapter 9

Chapter IX—War Pays Off

> *"It now appears, from the facts that are already available to the whole world, that we have fought the most diabolic war in history at the cost of unmeasured sacrifice only to find that our greatest enemy and the gravest threats to the honor, the integrity, and the continued existence of our free institutions, have moved right into our midst.*
>
> *"This repudiation, not only of the Potsdam Declaration, but also of every law of God and man, has been deliberately engineered with such malevolent cunning, and with such diabolic skill, that The American people, themselves, have been caught in an international death trap."*

Such is the well substantiated charge of Senator Capehart speaking in the greatest legislative body in the world, the United States Senate. The dealers of death, the international bankers, have collected their billions and will collect yet more from interest on the staggering debts they forced upon the various countries of the world. It would be natural to suppose that with the elimination of their two foremost competitors, Germany and Japan, these creatures would be content to close the highly profitable deal which finds them the only ones who gained anything out of all this bloodletting and international carnage. Blood-letting, it will be remembered, was the old method of curing all ills—the method of International bankers who so frequently seek to cure their ills in the blood-letting of war dates back to the same era.

But now as a Colossus of Credit these forces who are identified as those who caused the war and the ones who profited out of it, are working just as diabolically to simplify their control over world governments. This is being done by concentrating these nations into one single body, the

United Nations Organization with the World Bank to finance it. Of course, it must be presented under an attractive cover; and just after war, nothing could be more attractive than permanent peace. So that is the cover, while behind it is clearly discernable fact that there is no real attempt to establish peace and for that reason no peace solution has yet reached as far as the "scrap of paper" stage.

The words of Senator Capehart seem to come back like a refrain: "This repudiation, not only of the Potsdam Declaration, but also of every law of God and man, has been deliberately engineered with such malevolent cunning, and with such diabolic skill, that the American people, themselves, have been caught in an international death trap."

History is already establishing the wisdom of Representative Sumner, who said in the House of Representatives:

> *"Our Government's peace program is no peace program. The movement for it is led by the same old warmongers, still masquerading as princes of peace, who involved us in war while pretending their purpose was to keep us out of war. Like lend-lease and other bills which involved us in war while promising to keep us out of war, this measure (United Nations Organization) will involve us in every war here after. You know that there are going to be plenty of wars hereafter if you look at some of the small nations which, thanks to American aid and influence, are being enslaved: Indonesia, Persia, Korea, Burma, Turkey, Poland, the Baltics, and the Balkans. History shows that the people in these countries prefer death to slavery. The American people also always prefer death to slavery to foreign governments.*
>
> *"You know, of course, that this measure gives congressional authority for surrendering the American people to an all-powerful world supergovernment which will be controlled by imperialistic foreign governments, England and Russia. Advocates insist that it is not going to be a world*

superstate but what else could you call it? It is so coordinated with other world organizations, including the Bretton Woods organization, controlling all the money in the world, that it can and will reduce the American people to the same level of servitude now endured by millions in downtrodden imperialistic empires."

The American government was built into an organization almost synonymous with freedom as long as it was small enough for the people to have a hand in its operation and conduct. In this world superstate. The American people will have no part in the operation of this tool of financial racketeers and their political puppets. Other nations of the world will have no voice in the government. It is clearly an instrument of slavery at the hands of the few monsters who have directed the course of late world affairs. Jefferson was eternally right when he warned that the danger most likely to destroy the American nation would be certain selfish interests who would form factions of American citizens putting the policies of some foreign government ahead of their own United States.

Some of the blackest deeds of the American past will fade into insignificance compared with the common policy of a world government under the direction of its present rulers. For example, when the American marines were sent into Nicaragua some twenty years ago, the people were told they were going to see that an honest election was held there. While Americans were wondering why they were not sent into Chicago or Philadelphia if such were the case, the facts gradually leaked out and showed that the Marines were in reality sent to collect the debts owed to a couple of big banks in New York City which had lent money to the Nicaraguan government. With big bankers running the world supergovernment will anyone dare hope that such would be anything but common practice? Representative Sumner continues:

"That the decrees of this world supergovernment will be

illegal and unjust to Americans, we already know from sad experience. And what good will the American veto power do us? Look at how the American representative on UNNRA, Mr. Clayton, contrived to put through a motion giving Russia $250-million to which Russia was not legally entitled. Russia and England, the imperialistic governments controlling this supergovernment, have managed to pick American pockets all through the war we fought to save them. And what have Americans got out of this war? Nothing but Communism and corpses and this new eunuch world plunderbund, which is already despised even before it sets up its splendiferous new offices in Hollywood, or some less appropriate city."

The underlying purposes of this One-World set-up brought on by the late banker-controlled war are:

1. To destroy the Republic of the United States and overthrow free enterprise, setting up instead a superworld State based on a world money economy and dominated by the Money Power.

2. To spread lies, smears and intellectual confusion through the control of government, press, radio, schools, churches, movies and every channel of public information.

3. To take over industry, business and agriculture in a continuous planned emergency, with the money power directing the fixing of prices and wages.

4. To cultivate intense dependence on the Money Power State largely by keeping the citizens alert for hand-outs and passing blame for unsatisfactory conditions on a new version of "isolationists, reactionaries, fascists, etc."

5. To increase debts to the Money Power until the money power owns everything.

6. To make not only a few nations, but the whole world feeble subjects of the Money Power by the creation of a World Bank as a creative nucleous of the world superstate.

7. To completely destroy every vestage of nationalism and patriotism for the old Washington–Jefferson ideals of Americanism.

A few stalwart, patriotic Americans could see through all this and take courage to defy all these great and varied forms of opposition. For example, Representative Smith, of Ohio, on the floor of the House in speaking against the UN proposal said:

> *"Mr. Chairman, the future historian, when he comes to consider the action of the Congress which is about to be completed, may well pause and wonder I venture that he will regard this action as one of the most stupid and ruinous any nation ever undertook.*
>
> *"If the Public really understood the meaning of this grandiose scheme to establish a United Nations Organization and to make the United States a member of it, it would never be approved by the Congress; indeed it would never have been proposed in the first instance.*
>
> *"A vote for this measure is a vote for permanently underwriting with the sweat and toil of our people the economies of the other so-called member nations of this Organization. Further, it is a vote for guaranteeing with the blood of our sons and daughters the preservation of British imperialism. The nucleus of this international Organization is a military alliance between the United States and Great Britain, the rest being mainly window dressing….*
>
> *"This measure strikes at the very heart of the Constitution."*

No one could be a good American and at the same time oppose co-operation with other nations for the attainment of peace or any other beneficial end. Popular belief to the contrary, American tradition is steeped in efforts of international co-operation.

The United States originated many of the world's organizations which have been of permanent duration. Her record as an international "joiner" and participant in world congresses and conferences is unequaled by any other country. Because America refused to join the League of Nations her reputation as "isolationist" is undeserved. In fact, while the League debated and jockeyed over power politics, the United States worked for world peace with the Washington Naval limitations agreement, the Nine Power treaty, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and three disarmament conferences, before she was finally deserted by the dying League when Secretary of State Stimson opposed Japan's aggression in Manchuria.

The United States participated in 351 international congresses or conventions during a five year period, took part in 32 world expositions, was a member of 29 permanent commissions or international organizations and of 22 permanent international bodies where our Government was represented by civilian members. Many of these were represented by more than 51 nations, approximately the number now associated with United Nations.

The international congresses discussed 137 different subjects, almost the gamut of human activities. Many were lively shows as well as world shaking in importance.

Americans devoutly want peace and co-operation with other nations but when that ideal becomes a mask for a sell-out to a lying group of dastardly international cut-throats, Americanism must object. Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and San Francisco are sheeps clothings cloaking concentration which makes the takeover easier. If all the power for war or peace is in one source, only one source has to be taken over to have all this authority. The best that can be said of UN is that it was an experiment in the laboratory of idealism which blew up in the test-tube.

The McBride Report aptly says: "What is happening in this

country is not the accidental result of the impractical plans of idealistic do-gooders, but a well-organized and well-financed national and international conspiracy to loot the United States and take over control of our Government. A thorough investigation by appropriate committees of the Congress will show that such a conspiracy has long existed, yet those courageous and patriotic Members of Congress who, in the past, have dared to point out these dangers, have been jeered at, sneered at, ridiculed with cries of 'red baiting' and 'fascist' and subjected to a barrage of abuse by so-called liberals who are liberal only with other people's money. Sneers, jeers, and ridicule became a fine art through their use by the Intellectuals and Fellow-Travelers in the press, on the radio, and wherever people listen to them. In their most condescending and patronizing manner they smilingly and smirkingly referred to patriots who were pointing out these dangers to our Country as 'alarmists' who were seeing bogies under their beds. All this was done to provide a smoke screen and lull America to sleep while the conspirators carried out their traitorous plans."

International Bankers, those princes of pride and purse, care nothing for the particular brand of governmental philosophy. They finance fascism, communism, socialism, monarchies and democracies. True to the founder's words the International Bankers care not who make the laws of the nations as long as they are permitted to issue and regulate the money. No one noticed a change in British-U.S. relations since Britain went Socialistic. Hitler was not an especially bad sort of a fellow until he kicked the big Bankers out of Germany. Joe Stalin was Pal Joey as long as there was a possibility that he would seek a loan of several billion dollars.

These international bankers are in reality first cousins to international Communists. The British member of the British Economic Mission to Russia was Mr. Lawrence Cadbury, a representative of the Bank of England. The American member was

the pro-British Mr. Harry Hopkins, administrator for that bankers' implement, the lend-lease fund. The presence in Moscow of these spokesmen for international banking is significant.

During the war Thomas Lamont appeared on the platform at various pro-Russian rallies, some of which were conducted by American Communists. His presence at such meetings was regarded as a demonstration of Wall Street and Union Square solidarity.

In this period Wall street persuaded itself that Russia might become a broad field for capital investment and would at least be a heavy consumer of capital goods after the war.

Considerable credence was given to the Earl Browder line that capitalism and communism could work together. The former Communist party leader's statements were regarded as expressing a Kremlin need for foreign capital to develop Russia after the war. Such men of wealth as Willkie and Joseph Davies, former ambassador to Russia and wedded to the Post breakfast food millions, were calling on business to co-operate with the soviets in the expectation of creating a new field for capital investment.

The about face of the administration from the soft to the hard policy against Russia is traced by observers to the realization of Wall street that Russia will never be a field for capital development. In fact, Wall street now regards Russia as a dangerous enemy because she may seize the middle east and its rich oil deposits.

This fear was one of the reasons that dictated the administration policy on Greece and Turkey. The British have persuaded this administration to call for huge loans to that area. The British financial interests convinced Wall street that the American government should act in order to protect "American" financial interest. Of course, the British were not

concerned when Russia took over Poland because Poland does not sit on her life line through the Suez Canal while Greece and Turkey do.

Following the lead of Lamont, a host of lesser Wall street figures threw their lot with the New Deal to promote their financial interests or to play with power. Such influences are still felt in the government from within and without. Wall streeters are running the government from the inside and outside.

Because Wall streeters are traditionally pro-British (their Federal Reserve banking system being merely a branch of an International system with the Bank of England as another branch) the New York interests are for international, not American, interests taking their cue from British internationalists.

Corliss Lamont, son of Thomas Lamont, partner and president of J. P. Morgan and Co., has been an active Communist sympathizer for years. He has written many atheistic words in behalf of the Soviet system. In 1935, the Naval Intelligence Bureau listed him as a "fringe revolutionist" and described such agitators as those who are "too lacking in intestinal fortitude to go all the way with Communism, but stand by and urge the Communist to do his worst and provide him with protection, sympathy and defense, while he commits the overt act they have not had the courage to commit themselves."

In "Who's Who," young Lamont lists many of his pro-Soviet works and activities. He became popular with some of his father's friends after Russia entered the war. Young Lamont's latest sally is conducted as chairmanship for a drive for $25,000 for "Soviet Russia Today." His own donation is said to be "generous."

The Rockefeller families keep the Fellow Travelers around Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary. The Morgan

millions help Henry Wallace's friends and Marshall Field's wealth is notorious for the financing of a red-complected press. "Nationalization! I welcome it!" said Montague Norman, once Governor of the Bank of England. Bankers and Socialists flocked together to destroy private, free enterprise.

Those who persist in finding a Capital Communist tie-up difficult to comprehend need only to distinguish between Communism in theory and Communism in practice. Actually, Communism in practice becomes State Socialism which is the same result attained in a Money Government. Both are based on the same materialistic philosophy.

Such a course of policy is useful in advancing money and other aid to help Russia on one hand and in building up the British Empire interests as a check against Russia on the other hand. To say we need anyone's defense against Russia is pure nonsense in view of American incomparable superiority in every significant military category and industrial potentiality. The danger from Russian Communism is from within our own borders, not from Russian arms. Russia will never open war on America until her Communists and American fellow travellers disrupt transportation and production by strikes, sabotage our arms, undermine our armed forces, render our governmental agencies ineffective, and otherwise make America internally weak.

The banker-communist tie-up is horrified to think that the United States has a monopoly on the atomic bomb. And just why shouldn't the atom bomb be an American monopoly? America paid for the research on the bomb. It was made in America at American factories by Americans. America supplied all the essential materials. It was directed principally by Americans as outlined chiefly by American scientists. America is the only country to employ it and the only country that is capable of doing so.

The bankers and internationalists are anxious to give the atom bomb away because it blasted every excuse they could offer for

destruction of American sovereignty with American submission to their treasonous plan for world government, and because it made America so mighty that these treacherous interventionists can no longer say America is too weak to defend herself without the aid of Russia and England.

The present plan for atomic control smells of a treasonable attempt to give the most superior and revolutionary weapon to potential enemies. Bernard Baruch, international banker, maker of presidents and presidential policies, conducted negotiations for “adequate safeguards” as an excuse for what has been described as “a long series of futile negotiations to give the bomb to the world.” Baruch was representing the entire United States although he was never elected to an office as high as dog catcher in his long and meddling career. Before an unconstitutional organization he conducted an unconstitutional committee for an unconstitutional purpose in negotiations he had no authority to conduct in the first place.

It is believed that Russia has dishonorably acquired most of the essential information on the bomb but doesn’t even know what to do with it now that she has it. At Teheran, Russia and the United States agreed to swap military secrets and information. Russia gave us their information on the Katusha six-rocket gun, and we used it against Germany. Perhaps under this treaty, we have given them the atom bomb. Anyway our Chairman of the Board entrusted to keep the secret was a Russian sympathizer.

The present proposal for “control” says that by giving the atom bomb up and its secret away gives America security from the bomb. That is more foolishness. America has the bomb; other nations do not. American scientists have with actual demonstration every perfected detail; other nations do not. America has the factories and materials; other nations do not. On this point the Chicago Tribune rightly says:

“Are we likely to be safer from atomic bomb attack under those circumstances than we are now with the only stock of atom bombs in the world and unique experience in making them? As matters stand, what nation would dare challenge us to an atomic war with all this accumulated advantage on our side? Can we feel more secure when our advantage is gone? Would we feel more secure if every other nation knew as much as we do about building planes and flying them or if our navy were no stronger than any other? Then what reason is there to think that giving away the atom bomb will protect us more effectively than keeping it?

“We have made the offer, however, only to have it meet with criticism and skepticism, notably from Russia, whose Marxian scriptures call for the destruction of the American republic and whose custom it is to break treaties. The expectation plainly is that further concessions can be wrung from us. Mr. Baruch still is trying to find an acceptable formula for giving away the bomb. He has gone much too far already.”

Anyone acquainted with the pitiful yet laughable inferiority of Russia’s scientific status knows the only way they could ever get the bomb is to kidnap enough German scientists to make it for them, as they are trying to do, or to buy or steal it as they are known to be attempting to do with extremely heavy pressure, lies, deceits, spies and agents. What is more tragic, certain internationalists want them to succeed: They do everything contrary to the best interests of America.

It is not surprising that these same buzzards of the banking business engineered the San Francisco Charter which is but a carbon copy of other travesties on justice. For example, every weakness of the famous Kellogg Peace Pact is apparent in UN. Here are the mutual defects:

1. Obvious loopholes for crafty diplomats.

2. No provisions for rectifying the injustices in post-war

treaties.

3. Failure to renounce the real causes of war.

4. Ignoring the realities of European and other continental conditions.

5. Preparing of peace without even including the really peaceful nations—those who remained neutral.

6. Absence of good will without which peace talks a farce.

UN has one singular defect to distinguish it, namely the Veto. The nations themselves now admit this is the outstanding contribution to failure. Those who predicted this result at the time of the Veto adoption were called "obstructionists," "perfectionists" and worse, when they were merely pointing out the obvious.

In 1921 Robert Lansing, Secretary of State in the Cabinet of Woodrow Wilson, one of the most ardent erstwhile supporters of the League of Nations, wrote of the League in the book "The Peace Negotiations." Read the following comments and note how perfectly the words "United Nations" fit in when substituted for "The League,"

> *"The League . . . is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.*
>
> *"It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the might to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the Treaty and you*

will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed people are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

"This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the Quintuple Alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests of their own.

"It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo . . . but whatever it may be called, or however it may be disguised, it is an alliance of the Five Great Military Powers.

"It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of 'The Five' is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is Primary.

"The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the Council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

"We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest."

Tom Watson knew the real purpose of the League of Nations. In his address on the League of Nations he said:

> *"In the league, the great charter is engulfed, the sovereignty of the people disappears, and a universal monarchy is established.*
>
> *"The council of the league will absorb within itself judicial power, legislative power, and executive power (which World Government through Bretton Woods and the World Bank has already done)….*
>
> *"It pretends to assimilate the yellow race, the brown race, the black race, and the white race.*
>
> *"It pretends to harmonize democracy with imperialism, the kings with the republics.*
>
> *"It pretends to reconcile the Buddhists with the Confucionists, the Mohammedan with the Christian.*
>
> *"It pretends to make a seamless garment out of 33 Variegated pieces.*
>
> *"It pretends to expect international melody out of 33 discordant national notes.*
>
> *"If its real purpose is to put an end to just such disorder as the American colonists created, and the French created, and the South Americans created, when they broke the yoke of tyrannical kings, then the league will be a success.*
>
> *"If the real purpose is to create an international guaranty and collection agency for the great bankers and bondholders of indebted nations, then the league will be a success.*
>
> *"If the real purpose is to permanently fasten the yoke of the conquerors upon Egypt, Asia Minor, Africa, India, Oceanica, and the greater part of China, then the league will be a success."*

These frank commentaries on the League of Nations are equally applicable to UN because the United Nations Organization had the same aims and the same forces as authors. These same powers and their One World-Union Now sycophants, some of whom were decorated by foreign governments which constitutes recognition that they served another country better than their own, support any and every degrading American submission to the selfish whim of foreign debt-welshing ingrates, fight defenders of American sovereignty, ignore the simplest facts of history and the most evident every-day realities.

The treaties between the imperialistic powers that they will not push their political philosophies and power into each other's territory are about the most unrealistic things that could be imagined. Certainly Americans' own imperialistic one-worlders base all their thinking on the idea of sticking their noses into other people's business. This is why they are always wandering around in the old world instead of promoting a little pan-Americanism and American virtues of freedom.

At present the only free speech allowed anywhere in the old world is that which belittles the United States and her contributions in the war. In Italy Britain is broadcasting propaganda unjustly derogatory to America and erroneously flattering to herself at American expense! American contributions to the war effort were more than the rest of the world together for the following brief reasons:

America spent more money to fight the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan than Russia and the British Empire combined. America's army and navy were the major force in the victory in Europe and almost the sole force in defeating Japan. America's armies in Europe captured more German prisoners than the Russians, British, and French together. America's war production was greater than the combined British and Russian output. America equipped not only her own forces, but those of her allies. Lend-lease to the United Kingdom equalled one-third of that nation's own war expenditures. The Russian army

could not have moved without our automotive equipment, to which we added billions of dollars' worth of guns, tanks and planes. The French (after 1942) and the Chinese got all their modern weapons from us. America mobilized more men, out of a population of 140 million, than the British empire did from a population about four times as great.

Thus America gets "hooked" in innumerable ways for financing the personal selfish, dictatorial interests of Britain's real rulers and most of the ways are never breathed to the generous American taxpayer. The cover must be torn from this shameful saga of treachery in a detailed work before too long! Contrast giving Britain $4-billion with loopholes which leave not a single string attached to what happens when Britain loans. Several examples could be cited, but take Newfoundland for instance.

Newfoundland went broke in 1933. In return for aid from the British government it yielded its dominion status and was ruled by a commission and governor appointed in London. War prosperity, including large American expenditures on bases has bailed out the Newfoundlanders. The British government now has to plead its own insolvency to get a loan from the United States. When the British bail out another country, even one in their own family of nations, they require the bankrupts to submit to government from London. No such stipulation has been attached to the proposed American loan. Naturally, there is no disposition in this country actually to govern Britain, but while getting the loan the British have made no commitment to reform even financial policies inimicable to the United States. They have not even made the frank disclosure of their assets that any ordinary bankrupt is required to make in their country and ours Britain as a borrower is a far different customer than Britain as a lender.

Thus Senator Langer could say on the floor of the United States Senate: "I believe from the information given me, that several hundred persons, many of whom are British subjects,

others of whom have only taken out their first naturalization papers, and others deliberately planted here by foreign governments, are holding key positions in agencies controlling American foreign affairs, and that many of them are furthering British aims at American expense. I realize the seriousness of these charges, and would not make them unless I were satisfied that they are true."

Under the direction of international finance, the American policy toward another of the great "democracies"—Russia—is even more amazing. Referring to such nations as "democracies" truly makes the designation a word of knaves and fools, as has well been said: Of knaves who use it for ulterior purposes, or fools who believe it.

Senator Holt said during the war:

> *"What is the difference between the dictatorship of Germany and the dictatorship of Russia in world conditions today? Just two things: First, Germany is fighting England. Russia is not. What else is happening? Germany is a factor against England in world trade. Russia is not. Those are the two answers to why a difference and distinction is drawn by the administration between Russia and Germany—first, because Germany is fighting England; second, because Germany is becoming a factor in competition for world trade."*

There is less democracy in Russia than there is in Sing-Sing, for in American prisons there is at least freedom of religion and the hope of release and something better. Yet for a brief and accurate look at the American-banker policy toward Russia one could scarcely do better than ponder the words of Representative O'Kanski in a speech, "What Every American Should Know." He says:

> *"These international do-gooders will embrace anything and everything to keep going. Recently we have seen this crowd embrace and court the Communists. Because they love*

communism? Don't be silly. Communists do not like profiteers. But Communist Russia today is the most fertile field for international do-gooders and the Communists have fallen in love, and what a courtship it is.

"The Communists see in this a chance to weaken America and strengthen Communist Russia so they are accepting the courtship. No longer do the Communists denounce profits and big business. They are sweethearts now. As long as anyone makes a profit feeding Communist Russia it is O.K. with the Communists. So get ready, U.S.A., because what you have seen is only a sample. Get ready to dish out because now you are to be taken to the cleaners for good….

"We gave Russia (among many other things) 14,000 airplanes. Yet, whoever heard of Russia bombing anything except Finland. American airplanes and flyers had to do the job in the rest of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Our own boys had to wait until Stalin's appetite was satisfied. In return for lend-lease, it should be pointed out that every country we helped gave us something in return—except Russia. We cannot even get one little base from her to help us fight the Jap[anese]" . . . (Nor even a promise to discuss lend-lease settlement.)

"Our international do—gooders now have the following plans to help Russia: Lend-lease $22 Billion; three billion a year to Russia. UNRRA, $2-Billion; half of it to Russia or satellites. Bretton Woods $8-Billion; three billions to Russia. Commodity Credit, $2-Billion; one-half to Russia. Export-Import Bank, $2-Billion; on-half to Russia. Besides this, the international do-gooders are planning a $10 Billion loan to Russia. And besides that, the same givers want to wipe out the three billion Russia owes us from the last war. The combined total that these schemers want to give Russia in the next 5 years is about $20,000,000,000 of hard-earned American money.

"The U.S.A. built Hitler's war machine with U.S.A. money. The

U.S.A. built Japan's war machine with U..S.A. money. The U.S.A. is now building Russia's war machine with U.S.A. money. The U.S.A. makes its own wars—bigger and better as the years flee by."

The splendid little paper "Money" rightly sized up UN under a heading, "You Know UNO":

"When you know UNO you will see where it leads to total slavery, and you will not like the prospect.

"UNO is a Preface or Preparation for what is to follow, which is the Supreme World State. When that arrives UNO will fade out, you know, for it will have finished its work, which is to fool the people of the world to take the first steps into total slavery.

"The World Bank, you know, as well as UNO, are governments from without, both contrary to the concepts of so-called "democracy." Members will be appointed, not elected by the people.

"When the World Bank gets strong enough to dominate the World State UNO, you know, will fade out and the World State will be ruled by appointees of the World Bank, under cover you know. That will be after World War III. Then the screws will be turned tighter onto everybody under the World State and the World Bank."

The New York Times, always a fan for internationalism, in an editorial entitled "UN AT WORK," speaks with general satisfaction of all activities. It says of UN's Economic and Social Council that:

"It's real work will doubtless be done through its commissions, of which ten will meet here within the next few weeks. Housing, foreign investments, 'full employment, child welfare, crime, health, education, trade, living standards

> *and human rights all come under the Economic and Social Council's wing, either directly or by co-operation with other agencies. Literally, there is nothing human that the Council would find alien."*

The Times apparently is fully satisfied with this effort to run everything in the world by international edict for the benefit of the directing financiers. For that is precisely what this preposterously all-embracing scheme means.

Politically the gang in control is an international New Deal gang. It is closely related to international Communism, just as are many of the leading New Dealers in the United States. Only the situation in the international picture is worse. For while our national New Dealers almost without exception say they abhor Communism—even though the things they work for make up a large part of the complete Communist picture—so in the international New Deal a large part of the personnel are either friendly to Communism, and many of them are outright Communists. From evidence becoming available it is not too much to say that the ideologies, training, and education of nearly all the leading figures in the various subdivisions of UN stem straight from Moscow.

In the International Trade Organization, one of the United Nations' subdivisions, the United States although it produces the greatest volume of world trade, will have but a single vote. Other nations voting according to their national interests, will decide all questions of foreign trade of the United States. By a stroke of the pen of this international body the people can be told what they can buy, and where, and at what price; what to sow and when to reap; what they must make or refrain from making.

The National Economic Council in one of its semi. weekly letters calls this point to its readers attention. Through the International Trade Organization, the Food and Agricultural

Organization, the International Labor Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the International Bank and Fund, and all the other international New Deal outfits, all international relations will be regulated. Because the United States has but one vote in these alien bodies, they will be regulated in the interests of others than the United States. This great nation will have handed to others of alien philosophy and concepts the keys to her strong boxes, her homes, her economy, her security. The United States will have given to others the power to revise her customs, her laws, even the Constitution and the whole American way of life.

No one argues with the announced purpose of the United Nations Organization "to preserve peace and advance human progress." But it will not and cannot do either. Peace will not be preserved until the causes of war are removed. The Charter falsely accuses Germany and Japan as being sole causes of the war and proposes to disarm and keep these countries down as the means of preventing war. In the last hundred years France and England have been in five times as many wars as Germany and Japan combined. The charter is designed to punish one group of nations selected in advance, allegedly because of their war record which is insignificant in comparison with the self-appointed all-just unanimously chosen exemplars of peace. If the barest rudiments of justice existed the nations would oppose Russian domination of three-fourths of Europe with at least as much vehemence as they condemn Germany for domination of the city of Danzig—which city rightly belonged to her.

Imperialism and balance of power under the direction of International Finance were the causes of wars for the last century and a half. These the United Nations Charter dare not even mention, much less discuss and act upon. Complete control of the organization is in the hands of the four big nations, three of which are the most persistent and ruthless aggressors the history of the world has ever seen. The real peaceful nations, the neutral countries, are ignored.

Little nations like Iran, Finland or Denmark are not going to cause wars. It's the big nations who do that. Suppose Russia attacked Iran and the tiny victim appealed to UN. Russia as one of the Big Four would veto any attempt to declare her guilty. The only way Russia could be stopped is by violating the very Charter which exists for the purpose of preserving peace in the advancing of human progress.

Senator Shipstead of Minnesota who, except for Senator Langer of North Dakota, was the only man in the Senate to vote against UN said: "Unless and until Russia formally yields her veto power, there can be nothing settled, nothing agreed to or acted upon in the Security Council or the General Assembly that can possibly permit America to use the United Nations Organization as an instrument for peace.

> *"As it is now constituted, the Security Council remains an instrument of tyranny to maintain and enforce the secret commitments which are turning Europe and Asia into the breeding grounds of the third world war. If the time ever comes when the abolition of the veto power unlocks the present stalemate in the Security Council, America will still be confronted with the sordid secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which formed the foundations of the alleged 'peace' she has agreed to uphold and to enforce . . . On each occasion I stated that I refused to sign a blank check which was to be filled in secret by power politicians at a later date, and redeemed with American blood and treasure.*
>
> *"As it now turns out those blank checks have been filled in at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam with commitmeets which are a disgrace and an outrage to the Christian conscience and which now even threaten our own security."*

Senator Langer rightly criticized UN in a speech at Minneapolis when he pointed out:

"I say that the UN is not a democracy. It is an oligarchy. Five men can regulate the armament of every nation and establish and maintain their own military and naval staff. Small nations and minority groups are mere pawns in the hands of five men…. Our freedom has been bought too dearly to be entrusted to the whims of five men who are in no way accountable to the people for their actions." (This would have been a good place for the Senator to observe that four of these five men with such power over American freedom are foreigners.)

"The crux of the matter, as I see it, is that when large powers deal with smaller and weaker powers their desire is only to exploit, not to develop. The UN merely legalizes this exploitation…." "The UNO is not spreading the gospel of freedom that is our heritage and our strength. The UNO is merely a club in the hands of five Caesars to maintain the status quo and improve the political strength of the big powers. The UNO does not diminish the enmity of Russia and England but merely legalizes it, placing us square in the middle. Force is the frightening dictator and the UNO merely the amor behind which the dictator parades."

Americans, as great lovers of Democracy, would abhor this instrument to something approximating the proper degree if they knew the manner in which it was enacted. John R. Flynn said in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate:

"As one who has been watching propaganda for a great many years, I take off my hat. You cannot turn on the radio any hour of the day—morning, noon or night—whether you listen to the Metropolitan Opera or to a horse opera, a hill-billy band, a commentator, or a newscaster that you do not hear a plug for this great instrument of peace.

"Nobody know what it is all about. Nobody has read it. Nobody

> *knows what is in it. It is the kind of propaganda that Hitler taught the world so effectively—'Don't argue with the people. Just put your idea in a slogan or phrase and repeat it a dozen times a day until it is taken for granted.'*
>
> *"This is what you have done. You have brought into existence a military alliance between four great powers, three of them great aggressors, and around that central core of the military alliance you have placed a halo of small nations without any power to do anything, selling it to the world as a great organization of peace."*

It was a propaganda so vicious it would not tolerate any ordinary questions of an open mind. Anyone who tried to look behind the slogans, to reason on obvious defects of the plan, or to offer the mildest objection the manner of its enactment, immediately brought the worst pressure of the Smear and Suppress troopers into full play. The sincere Senator from Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, complained on the floor of the Senate as follows:

> *"Today any man who dares to speak his deepest convictions, even in what he conceived to be the highest service of his country not only does not get a hearing, but he is reviled and smeared, his intentions publicly slandered, and his reputation broken on a twisted rack of interventionist lies…. Mr. President, all I have to say to the American people is that if, as our contemporary wolf pack of propagandists is attempting to prove by its yapping, the simple statement of historical facts and American principles and ideals is derisive, destructive, or subversive to American interests, then America as a nation of free peoples is already blindly groping toward her doom."*

Then rising to one of the heights of statesmanship for which history will know and revere him, Wheeler said:

> *"If the lights of reason are extinguished here in America, if we as a nation are to revert to the pagan faith of tyrants that truth cannot and will not triumph in free conflict, the hope for moral leadership among the nations and the peoples of the earth will perish for long years to come. If, in the future, the individual and all the dignity of the human personality and the creative genius of the human mind and spirit is to be compelled to exist only as a means to an end, namely for the state, the world of the future will degenerate into a vast intellectual, moral, and spiritual concentration camp. With such a trend in international affairs an ever growing reality, I cannot help but cry out in protest."*

It was then pointed out that in all the hundred and eleven articles in the Charter of the United Nations Organization there is not one single clear specific provision for the protection of the individual human personality of which the society of nations is composed In spite of the ballyhoo about establishing the "four freedoms" throughout the world, the terrifying fact stands out that there is no bill of rights, no protection for the individual against tyranny.

Lovers of Democracy will object to subjection to the control of appointed, not elected, officials with absolute power answerable to no one. The people have no choice, can give no sanctions, can demand no reasons for any choice of personnel or course of action. The people can give no list of duties, place any restrictions or grant any standard of qualifications.

The adoption of the Charter turns upside down the Constitution of the United States which does not need here or anywhere else a defense or eulogy as the cornerstone of the American nation and the one great bulwark of freedom and Democracy. **In Article II section 1, paragraph 8** of the Constitution contains the oath of office as taken by the President of the United States and under it no President can legally delegate a

representative to a world conference; The Constitution provides only for the election of officers—it does not permit the delegation of officers for the purpose of carrying out executive powers.

Article I, Section 9, paragraph 7 of the Constitution provides and makes obligatory the publication of reports or accounts and receipts of public moneys. Yet, in the Charter, America is obligated by the Assembly to pay unknown sums for unknown purposes, which will not be, according to the Charter itself, publically accounted for.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution prescribes for definite sums of moneys for the raising of a definite armed force. How then can America be legally obligated, as it is in the UN Charter, to indefinite sums of money for an indefinite length of time for an indefinite number of men for helping the armed forces of world government—armed forces which will establish peace even if it takes continual war to have it, and will establish freedom even if forced upon them tyrant-like and conducted on rules laid down by the dictators who forces Democracy upon them.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 9 of the Constitution establishes tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court. Under it no place can be found that permits Congress to establish tribunals or to submit the people to tribunals superior to the Supreme Court, as is done by the enactment of the UN Charter. The fact that this has not been done, directly at least, does not prove such provisions are not there when anyone who can read with his eyes instead of his prejudices can see them in black and white and learn that they are there.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution gives to Congress the regulation of commerce of the nation. There is no right by which an unknown, unpredictable, uncongressional group of men, most of which are not even Americans, may exercise power over the trade and commerce of the United

States.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution clearly states that the President of the United States is to be the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. This is completely violated in the direction given to the American forces in the Charter' s world police force.

The Charter does not protect the United States. It does not protect the smaller nations. Who does not protect then? Only the financiers who use it as a clearing house for their business supplied by UN' s better half, the World Bank. It is inconceivable that anyone would declare publically, much more propagandize it with the expectation that anyone will believe it, that America will face less hazards by sticking her nose in every quarrel over the face of the earth than she would have acting independently.

The world has the Supreme Authority for saying that there can only be "peace on earth to men of good will." (The popular version has it "Peace on earth good will toward men," which, besides being scarcely intelligible, is a flagrant mistranslation of et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.) However, the Charter is not only absolutely devoid of anything approaching a moral basis, but is composed of a litany of deceptions, evasions, a jargon of cynical double meanings for different occasions.

But with the best will in the world toward true world peace, can any rational mind look for this peace from any organization composed of politicians and militarists—all puppets in the hands of the international bankers? There are many intelligent pacifists, both men and women, in all the countries. In India there was a Gandhi. Why were not these people called to serve any United Nations' project? Instead of that, we see this "peace" organization dominated by the Big Four, aggressive nations all, and even planning a world police force to carry out their dicta. Can those people ever come to

peace? One is reminded of Bernard Shaw's remark in Caesar and Cleopatra: "And so, to the end of history, murder shall breed murder, always in the name of right, honor and peace, until the gods tire of bloodshed and create a race that can understand."

The "Frisco fiasco" was derived from the most abysmal and groveling ignorance of history as well as a grave and studied misrepresentation of current world realities. To assume that our erstwhile enemies are war-minded and our fair weather allies are peace-loving is to ignore the obvious fact that two allies have been guilty of "treacheries" and "sneak attacks" in recent times.

The San Francisco Charter instead of eliminating war possibilities and establishing peace merely lays down rules for rivalry between the contending powers At the very time they talked of peace, Russia was giving military training to 15-year-olds while the United States was trying to put over one year of compulsory military training and the largest army and navy in the history of the country. Britain, the first-rate exploiter and fifth-rate military power the big banks are pledging America to uphold and defend, is now nothing more than an island outpost off the coast of a Russian Europe. The buffer nation against Russia in the West (Germany) and the buffer against Russia in the East (Japan) are now eliminated; so it is to be expected that unless Russia comes across the big banks will soon rebuild Germany and Japan to powerful military powers. A mere sentence or two in a charter even far more respectable than that of UN will mean nothing in the way of an effective deterrent

America pays the bill for UN operation—50 % of the administrative costs and virtually all of the World Bank's funds which finance the organization. People have shouted at the author, "Peace is cheap at any Price!" Even granting that this stupid set-up could under any set of circumstances bring peace, why do not other nations make the sacrifice of token

payment? Since when has peace become a bargain only for the United States? Are bribed friends ever true ones? If Uncle Sam has to buy the machinery of peace why can't he operate it? There should be nothing illogical in his running to suit himself something he bought and paid for. Uncle Sam is asked to pay all this because he is the richest in the world. His per capita debt is the largest in the world. Only in a bankers logic, or lack of it, could a man the furthest in debt be called the richest! What a farce!

In UN an elaborate system of pressure, discriminations, and boycotts is provided by the charter to enforce international trade collectivist upon member nations. World trade organizations are expected to enforce an international planned economy which means simply that U.S. trade will be under the direction of One World Superstaters. They yell "America must co-operate." Co-operate with anyone about anything even if it means co-operating the taxpayers pockets inside out and the constitution upside down!

It is a temptation to take the UN charter and the Bretton Woods agreement part by part and expose their sinister plots, but obviously our space is too limited. The purpose here is to expose the financial interests behind them and the reasons for their actions. The words of real American nationalists are heavily drawn upon for this purpose, not only to show that this danger is more than one man's opinion, but also to teach the principle of patriotic Americans who find their teachings either misrepresented or met with a conspiracy of silence.

This over-head Utopia, according to Hearst's characterization "began with a death, not a birth certificate, at San Francisco. It was the child of vain imaginings, of war time hypocrisies, of unrealistic vaporings of the mind, of brutal designs, of transparent bad faith, and of conflicts which even the blind mind could have understood if willing to accept self-evident facts.

"It is time to remove the body. Public health requires a proper disposal of the remains before the precarious condition of the world becomes worse for the quarrels over the body. The enraptured have had their rhapsodies and are now silent. The one world has dissolved into its component parts of intrigue, force, greed, and conflict."

That the UN is a complete failure as far as its ostensible purpose of a World Supergovernment is concerned, does not mean it is not dangerous. The bankers are not completely satisfied with this turn of events but are still able to use it to good advantage as a clearing house for the real institution of control—the World Bank. That UN has failed to promote friendly relations among nations but has instead created ill will and benefited only potential aggressors, means nothing to them.

… Representative William Lemke of North Dakota said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"It is the first time in the history of our Nation that we have put our stamp of approval upon liquidation and theft by three of the bigger nations of the smaller nation's people and territory. We had better let some other nation pass judgment upon us rather than to rest secure by the ignorant, self-laudation, and admiration that we hear from time to time by those who think more of the ideologies of foreign nations than of our own.

"America, watch your step! There are things going on here in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. This bill (UN) is one of them…. We are allowing our form of government to slip away from us.

"We have been deceived in the past and we are being deceived now. We were told that Bretton Woods would satisfy these "50 peace-loving nations," that it was the road to eternal peace. Then we were told that UNRRA was our salvation, that by acting as Santa Claus for a select few nations was the road

to permanent peace.

"Then we were told the reciprocal trade agreement was sure enough the road to heaven, eternal joy and peace forever. Finally it was drummed into us that UNO was the dove of peace with pure white wings, the only way to outlaw war.

"Now the advocates of these things tell us that we must have a larger Army and a larger Navy than the combined armies and navies of the world….

"We are told that we must have peace-time draft, to prevent Germany, Italy and Japan from again disturbing the peace. I challenge not only the correctness of that statement but its sincerity…. "History teaches us that this world never has been or can be ruled by fear—by one nation overawing all other nations. It teaches us that 'One world' lunacy never succeeded and never will succeed. Even if temporarily successful, it always falls to pieces because of its own corruption.

"To live in peace, not in fear, must be the future aim of the family of nations. Caesar, Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, and Napoleon all died of the same disease 'one world' lunacy. Hitler's and Mussolini's ambitions hit upon the same rock."

Writing from San Francisco during the [United Nations] conference John O'Donnell wrote in a New York Daily News:

"Nothing ever was staged in this generation on such a scale of mass hypocrisy and global double-cross. Never, even at the Peace Conference of World War I or the sessions of the so-called world leaders during the '20's, was a meeting of international political leaders staged against such a background of confusion, suspicion and cynicism as exists right here in this city at the present time.

"If you don't believe it you should have heard the lusty

belly laugh that went up from the reporters representing the so-called United Nations when they read a piece by one of the professed world-savers who passionately proclaimed in print that this San Francisco conference is "not only the greatest international meeting ever held on U.S. soil, it is the most important human gathering since the Last Supper….

"The foreign boys are not going to shoot Santa Claus here in San Francisco, but they intend to take a peek in the bag and guess how much more is coming.

"The cruel and bitter fact about this disorganized political circus being staged by big shots who no longer represent the citizens of their respective nations is that the publicity buildup for what is essentially a sordid bit of political trafficking and the paying off of secret contracts presents this conference of debtors to the U.S. Treasury and the nation's blood bank in a religious and spiritual setting, with much public beating of the breast and vowing of the peace to come in the best revivalist tradition of the late Billy Sunday and Aimee McPherson."

The American Indians missed out by not attending and getting in on the cut by demanding back at least forty-six states. In the international babel at San Francisco twenty-two different languages were spoken, but the confusion of tongues was greatly lessened because "lend-lease," "reparations," "loans," and the like are all translated by the simple directive "gimme," which was the only word forty-five of the countries was interested in.

Examples of hypocrisy, suspicion and arrogance were many on the part of the leading nations, but Russia was by far the worse offender. Although only twenty of the forty-six nations gave plenipotentiary power to their delegates, the Russians went so far as to have their own private ships in San Francisco harbor with private wires in secret codes which were

urgently used before even the simplest commitment. Soviet OGPU, spies and secret service were constantly on the alert. They made their demands as of right, practically as orders from Stalin to the conference. They bothered with neither argument or logic.

If the United Nations were more united there would undoubtedly have been more success at Lake Success. UN is instead a cuckoo land for “gimme Jimmies’; who make Peace a mere period of deceit, treachery, suspicion and conspiracy between two periods of armed conflict.

The United States will have peace only when it repudiates this one world hypnosis and returns to the Constitution on which the country was founded, especially Article I, section 8, paragraph 5 which would put international bankers in the banking business instead of misruling the world in the manner traced in this volume which shows, among other things, that the only thing the late European war settled for the United States is the fact that Germany can be beaten. But at $300-billion a war, that might not be possible again.

At San Francisco nothing basic has been done to eliminate the cause of war by preventing depressions (monetary panics) with their unemployment and poverty. Just as despair will again drive idle men to crimes of violence, so will it lay hold of nations and again lead them to the crime of war. Nothing has been attempted which would establish the true foundation of peace by creating the necessary conditions in all nations for unfolding production and employment by means of a sensible democratic money system replacing the privately controlled money system now exploiting men and nations everywhere.

San Francisco thereby furnished the direct proof that those who concocted this war, because their financial interests were menaced, did so in order to eliminate the dangerous example which Germany had set by the reform of her money system, an example which, if permitted to have been continued in peace,

would certainly have led to its adoption by other nations and to the destruction of the present financial enslavement of the world. This danger is now removed, perhaps for all time. But those who made World War II are identical with the agents of High Finance who secretly dominated the San Francisco Conference. Through the adoption of Bretton Woods the gold standard, challenged by Hitler, has been re-introduced in a veiled form for universal domination. The world is now being bent to its command.

Today the world participates in a hellish plot to make any liberation of a nation from financial enslavement impossible. The descendants of the men who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights now hold down their nation and other nations who are clamoring only for the right to live and become prosperous by work. Economic contraction and unemployment and poverty must be their lot while they are not permitted even to learn the origin of their chains. A wiser policy on the part of the United States would be to enforce Article I, section 8, paragraph 5 of the Constitution, and by the multiple benefits which would then be allowed to unfold establish by her example the right to propose the means of lasting world peace.

The half dozen blocks of New York City real estate recently donated by John D. Rockefeller as a permanent site for the home of UN is not nearly as generous on his part as it is supposed to be. The offer carries a provision that the sum be exempt from taxation. It may safely be assumed that Mr. Rockefeller falls into the highest income bracket and therefore pays by far the greater part of his taxable income to the government. What the United Nations received will therefore be almost wholly at the expense of the United States Treasury if the proposed legislation to exempt the price of this donation from taxation is adopted. There can be no sense of justice in this arrangement unless it is just to burden the American people with far more than their proportionate share of the costs of maintaining the organization, without even

giving them credit for doing so.

Acceptance of this gift does not add dignity nor demand respect on part of the organization, being composed as it is of fifty-seven nations including the largest and richest in the world. Granting this “tremendous” gift by Rockefeller demonstrates that United Nations is not altering world conditions to the detriment of the big financiers who, as has been seen, have been misruling the world so disastrously for everyone but themselves. With the firmer establishment of their domain in their creature (UN operated through the World Bank) it was well worth the comparatively insignificant sum of $85-million—the value of the real estate given to UN.

The proposed headquarters will be but an $85-million marble obituary tombstone for the already dead UN. A quonset hut would be permanent enough for its activities in the realms of chicanery, fraud and deceit. If it must have huge marble buildings, let it go to Geneva. That would put it across the ocean where, if anywhere, it belongs.

The United Nations secretariat has submitted a proposed international bill of rights to a drafting subcommittee of the human rights commission. Ironically enough, Russia sits on the commission of human rights. But this gives a clue as to what the finished product would be. Far from reinforcing the existing freedoms of Americans, the bill undermines them. This proposed Bill of Rights veers to the Left.

If the United Nations had any interest in securing to people anywhere the liberties which guarantee their private persons against the encroachments of tyranny, it would only have to take for its model the one great nation in the world where the sanctity of the individual has been confirmed by written guarantee which have lasted through every crisis for 158 years.

But the UN secretariat was not interested in effective means

to safeguard Americans or any one else in the rights which the American people have always known under the Republic. The obvious intention was to attempt to reconcile practices which make for a complete absence of freedom in numerous member states with rhetorical formulas which might seem to promise much without, in fact, granting the individual anything.

Thus, although the UN draft, as ably analyzed by the Chicago Tribune, restates the American concept that no one shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law, the assurance is tempered with the proviso that "detention by purely executive order shall be unlawful except in time of national emergency"—no restriction being placed on the right of the executive to declare such emergencies. One is reminded of article 48 of the Weimar constitution which proved the fatal weakness of the German republic. This enabled the executive to suspend constitutional processes at any time in favor of ruling by decree. The article was invoked so often under the presidency of Field Marshal von Hindenburg as to make for the rise of Hitler.

In its statements of social purpose, the UN draft bill is even more vicious. It proclaims that "every one owes a duty of loyalty to his state and the United Nations. He must accept his just share of responsibility for the performance of such social duties and his share of such common sacrifices as may contribute to the common good." And again, that in the exercise of his rights "every one is limited by the rights of others and by the just requirements of the state and the United Nations."

Honored by attacks from Washington and London the above mentioned Daily points out that it is obvious that any definition of what freedom is aiming at is a restriction on freedom. Freedom is either unalienable—a natural endowment of human beings—or it is nothing. It is less than nothing when it is reduced, as U.N. reduces it, to propagandistic statements of social intention, totalitarian in their inspiration.

Among the worst examples of this are declarations that every one has “the right and duty” to perform socially useful work in return for the right “to such equitable share of the national income as the need for his work and the increment it makes to the national welfare may justify.” This is Marxian dogma and nothing else and, as the fruits of the Marxian experiment in Soviet Russia show, it has not the least relationship to freedom.

If Americans hope to hold their ancient liberties under the Bill of Rights, they will have nothing to do with the bill of duties by which U.N. asserts the subjection of the citizen to the ends of the state. It is a franchise for tyranny, here and everywhere.

The United Nations in action could not be expected to be anything else but what it is in view of its conception, birth and up-bringing. Thus the recent Balkans investigation commission appointed by the United Nations fixed responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for creating disorders along the Greek border. The United States and seven other countries put the blame on these soviet satellites. Russia and its Polish puppet dissented. France refused to record an opinion.

As in all other activities of U.N., the communist camp was lined up against the non-communist. The report is another indication that the description united as applied to the nations composing the world organization is farcical. One worlders and goody-goodies who want to give America away are confronted with the disappointing evidence that U.N. cannot command any loyalty from the member states capable of rising above the narrowest national self-interest. Its decisions are in all instances political. Principle is an extraneous element.

Thus the conclusion of the Chicago Tribune seems to be a fair and solid judgment. Says the Tribune:

> *"Those who were most active in forming U.N. had three purposes in mind: 1, To affirm that the creation of U.N. provides moral justification for our having gone to war; 2, to create a world agency for the continuing oppression of the peoples of Asia and Africa by imperialists; 3, to establish a vehicle for depriving American citizens of rights they have under our Constitution through perversion of the treaty power or by asserting that U.N. dicta have binding effect on American citizens."*

The internationalism fostered by international bankers must be replaced by Americanism fostered by Americans. America shall be on the way to peace when the following dream of Thomas Jefferson becomes realized:

> *"I hope (to see) a cordial fraternization among all the American nations, and . . . their coalescing in an American system of policy totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe. The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian or partition through the ocean which separates the two Hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other…. I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe.*
>
> *". . . Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with Cis-Atlantic affairs."*

This would necessitate the eradication of the power behind European and American powers—international banking. This is not isolationism. This is not reactionary. It is just a plain fundamental common sense patriotic principle of America First. It has much more to recommend it in leadership, theory and practice than does the lunacy of our present muddlers who

continue to sneeze when the International Bankers take snuff, and who in theory try to correct former mistakes by making still greater mistakes and who in practice place America last in everything nationally desirable!

In 1944 Reverend Arthur Terminello delivered an address in which he said:

> *"Shall victory consist in capturing and punishing Hitler? He deserves it. But even that is not worth one American life.*
>
> *"Shall victory mean teaching the Germans democracy? They tried it once and decided they did not want it. To teach them the lesson, are we going to stand over them for decades with a stick? Our victory will then consist in teaching them democracy by force. What a farce! What a farce when they—the liberated enemies—see the ruthless, soul-less, barbarian, communistic hordes ready to pounce upon them as soon as the teacher leaves the class-room!*
>
> *"We too have a stake in this war as well as those in comfortable offices in the Pentagon or the Treasury Buildings or the White House…. Should American soldiers go on dying because Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin cannot agree on what is to be done with foreign countries which do not belong to them?"*

This speech was a prophesy. Not only are the barbarian hordes ready to pounce upon our fallen enemies as soon as our troops are withdrawn but the warmongers who forced us into that war are setting up a world government to destroy us as a nation. They are endeavoring to accomplish by treason within what Germany, Italy, and Japan failed to do by military aggression from without, thus proving that they are the worst enemies we have on the face of this earth. Not only that but they are the enemies of every other nation. World government is treason.

Now consider Bretton Woods with the World Bank and the World

Fund. Although set up before UN they are treated last because they were by far the more important. Without them that clearing house of international finance, United Nations, would never have come into existence.

UN is to centralize political control while Bretton Woods is to centralize economic control—through finance, of course. Bretton Woods is the final consummation of gradual monetary encroachment which began with the establishment of the Bank of England centuries ago.

So long as the Bretton Woods agreement is permitted to function unhampered it does not matter in the practical functioning of the One Worlders scheme if the UN remains an innocuous debating society, especially if its activities, or lack of them, get the publicity.

The World Bank established at Bretton Woods is a Utopia born of One World ideology which reduces the people of the world to the status of serfs and slaves of an international monster which from its very nature is corrupt, oppressive and intolerant. It silently and secretly emerged from the Nation's most dishonored and immoral spot, Wall Street, the cancer at the heart of American Government.

The difference between the financial control before and after Bretton Woods is not one of kind, but of degree. It would have been as impossible to reform the corrupt money and banking system by going into partnership with Morganthau and his international bankers as it would have been to reform hell by going into partnership with the devil and his henchmen.

Like U.N., the Bretton Woods issue was staged, and the agreements put across are a sad commentary on what propaganda can do to democracy. Bretton Woods advocates howled that they wanted co-operation and idiot-like yelled that all who opposed them did not want co-operation. Bretton Wooders have no monopoly on co-operation. They use the same twist on the word

“peace.” Making unsound loans without any adequate assurance that they will be used for productive purposes, taking foreign benefits at the expense of other peoples, do not promote peace. Yet all who oppose those loans were tagged as opponents of peace.

Concerning their lusty howl of “stabilization” Lewis Haney, Professor of Economics at NYU, says:

> *“There can be no stability in the relation between any two things which are themselves erratic and unstable. The only known way to stabilize exchange is to stabilize the currencies that are exchanged. This they do not propose. There is no sense in talking about stable exchange rates while leaving the currencies of the several nations unstable.”*

Every representation concerning Bretton Woods was false, many of them deliberately so. It had nothing to do with its announced objectives but it had much to do with the unannounced objectives as outlined by Samuel Crowther writing in the Hearst Newspapers, as follows:

> *“These unannounced objectives are:*
>
> *“(1) To permit the present governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom to print money and get away with it until such tune as other arrangements can be made, in exactly the same fashion as Hitler printed money and got away with it until other arrangements were made for him. Any government can print money, but it can stay in power only so long as the money will buy things.*
>
> *“(2) To put into the hands of the United States, the United Kingdom and Soviet Russia a strangle hold on the money of the world and therefore a strangle hold on the welfare of the peoples of the world.*

> *"Since any two of these partners can out vote the third, it could come about that the United States might be a candidate for strangulations. London and Moscow have, during the war, made a comprehensive treaty, only a part of which has been disclosed. This treaty will not be affected by anything that happens at San Francisco. They are full partners. We are trying to buy our way into the firm.*
>
> *"(3) To put into the hands of the Soviet government the sum of $900 million. For this Stalin will put up a wad of paper money that he will print for the purpose and for which no one assumes a liability. That is, Stalin can borrow nearly a billion dollars without owing anybody for it. In another part of the scheme. Russia can borrow an indefinite number of dollar probably running into the billions at a very low rate of interest on a simple promise to pay.*
>
> *Of course this promise to pay cannot be enforced and equally of course Russia may repay in anything it chooses to call money."*

The fact that exchange is international does not require a world authority to fix exchange rates, any more than a world authority is required to fix weights and measures. The yard and the meter, for example, are definite quantities everywhere, because there are standards for them that can be objectively ascertained.

Co-operation, peace, stabilization is feasible without any fund or bank. The place for America to start them is in America. By what authority are these ends going to be established for the world when each individual nation composing the group failed miserably to secure them in their own countries? The authority that seeks to override the failures and differences of nations can only be found in the unsavory activities of international finance. It had the accidental assistance of other sources, especially from

Franklin D. Roosevelt who saw it as a world wide “New Deal” which would absorb his American (sic!) counterpart with its prolonged depression and unemployment in spite of his spending sprees which reached astronomical proportions. Thus it is not surprising to find Roosevelt historically notorious as a cat’s paw for those who think America should pay for the privilege of getting her pockets picked.

Bretton Woods has the same philosophical basis of cheating that is found dominating the Federal Reserve banks and the other branches of international banking It is reliably related that the Federal Reserve had bills—World Bank bills—ready to circulate gradually by taking up U. S. currency by exchanging it. This process was to continue until all America’s currency was World Bank money.

According to the Bretton Woods-Federal Reserve system all the standards of common honesty which men must follow in their daily intercourse do not apply to governments. A good example is given by Samuel Crowther. If a merchant buys goods and does not pay for them, he will end in bankruptcy and possibly in jail; but if a nation does this it can issue a decree making it illegal for citizens to pay their bills to foreigners and the default becomes “blocked exchange.”

If a merchant draws checks without any money in the bank and, when the checks bounce, he offers a new issue of rubber checks, he will in most States go to jail; but when a government does this, it is called “going off the gold standard.”

If a merchant sold orders for goods on himself and then doubled his prices when the orders were presented in order to give only half the goods the orders called for when issued, he would go to jail as a cheat; but when a government does this, it is said to have “devalued its currency.”

Experts in this rot by which the world is run became monetary

experts for the big event at Bretton Woods. The plan was drawn up and the only deliberations permitted were limited to ratifying the plans as written. This might be laughable if it did not place a levy which amounts to about $230 on each American family, to say nothing of the putrid system it makes all the more fixed.

The Minority Report on the World Bank and the International Fund printed as a senate document of the Government printing office contains a bit of genuine Americanism. It is to be regretted that the names and methods of the people behind the scheme are not exposed. However, it reports five principle reasons for opposing the enactment are well worth repeating.

> *"1. It involves the expenditure of $5,925,000,000 of the taxpayers' money with negligible benefit to the people of the United States.*
>
> *"2. It entrusts $5,925,000,000 of the money of American taxpayers to be disposed of by boards of directors on which we have only 1 director out of 12, and only from 27 to 35 percent of the voting power, although we deposit more than half of the real assets in the funds. The terms on which our money is to be lent are fixed by a board controlled by the very nations which wish to borrow that money.*
>
> *"3. These measures, added to the other policies endorsed by the Administration, embark the United States on a vast program of lending money abroad and guaranteeing private investments abroad, which program is wasteful of our assets, will create a false and inflated export trade leading to depression, and is more likely to create ill will than good will toward the United States.*
>
> *"4. Purporting to solve the world's economic troubles, neither the fund nor the bank offers a solution for the present emergency difficulties of a single country during the transition period, nor can the fund accomplish any of its*

alleged purposes during the transition period.

"5. The fund attempts to set up a world-wide monetary authority and a system of managed currencies. While there are so many loopholes that we doubt its effectiveness. it can impose serious limitations on our freedom of action in economic matters and force a regimented control of exchange."

Amplifying these reasons the report says:

"In effect it (the World Bank Plan) involves our Government and other governments in a guarantee of private loans and investments abroad. Our Government does not guarantee private investments in the United States, and we believe it is dangerous and unwise to embark on a permanent policy which amounts to government guarantee of private investments abroad.

"The bank may make direct loans, but that is not intended to be its principal business. The ordinary procedure will be as follows: A foreign nation-or foreign corporation seeking a loan will come to the bank and ask the bank to guarantee such a loan. If the loan is to be made to a private foreign institution such as a public-utility company or an automobile manufacturer, the government of that country will have to guarantee the loan also. When the guaranty is given, the country or its corporation may float that loan in any country where it wishes to borrow the money and the loan will carry the guaranty of the International Bank.

"It is fairly obvious that most of the loans sought will be in the United States, and we will, therefore, see a large financing operation with billions of dollars of these guaranteed securities widely advertised to American investors. While the United States Government is only responsible up to $3,175,000,000, the whole $9,100,000,000 of potential loans could be sold in the United States. The impression certainly will prevail that the United States

Government is largely back of all these investments. Should there be a general default by the governments such as occurred in 1932, our Government might be morally obligated to make good the whole amount.

"It is quite true that the United States has the right to veto any loan to be floated in dollars in the United States. This veto, however, is not reserved to Congress, so that we are, in effect, being asked to authorize the executive department to approve the sale of guaranteed foreign securities in the United States up to the total amount of $9,100,000,000.

"In effect, therefore, the bank is a tremendous plan, under the guise of international co-operation, to lend our people's and our Government's money abroad.

"It is said that the money of other governments will also be used and thereby reduce our burden…. But under present conditions the whole burden will fall on us…. Few currencies are of any value outside of the country of issue unless we make them good. Any international fund, therefore, is not really international. It looks to the United States for support, and for some years to come it is merely a camouflaged method of lending American money and that of a few other solvent nations."

Another important fact for Americans to consider is that under the articles of agreement of the bank, the dollars that are borrowed do not even have to be spent in the United States and we are prohibited from so requiring. A new plant, in India for instance, may borrow dollars, buy all its equipment in England, and thus, in effect, help England pay her blocked sterling balances. Most of the guaranteed loans will undoubtedly be floated in the United States because our people have the savings to invest. The bank thus becomes a device for draining our savings out of the United States for the benefit

of the rest of the world.

No wonder the British delegate at Bretton Woods made the following statement:

> *"Collapse is inevitable: Relax and enjoy it!"*

An example of how the scheme works for the advantage of a foreign money man at American expense is seen in the British policy of blocked sterling balances towards its spheres of influence. This sterling can only be used for purchases in England and cannot be exchanged for dollars. In fact, today Americans are unable to sell goods in India or Egypt, for example. The testimony shows that an American pump manufacturer who has sold for many years in India is unable to obtain an import license. Although we have been distributing dollars freely in India, the English have collected all these dollars and given the Indians blocked sterling in exchange. Now import licenses are refused, primarily because the British Government will not let the India citizens use their United States dollars.

Another urgency for Bretton Woods is found in the big moneyed power's interest in the Russian situation. Stalin does not care a snap for the "security" offered by Bretton Woods. He is making his own security by marching his ruthless hordes over three-fourths of Europe. As for dominance of the Big Three, that might be a nuisance for Stalin because he dominated all he wants and is not interested in democracy or social advancement. But getting a lot of American machinery and cash for nothing more than signing a few scraps of paper sends the internationalists into a frenzy.

Paul Mallon writing from Washington in the New York Daily Mirror says:

> *"It is nothing like a bank except that it will be a place for foreign nations to get money. It is really a credit guarantee*

institution.

"Only one-fifth of its proposed loans for rehabilitation and development will be made directly by it. The other four-fifths will be guarantees of loans by private bankers.

"As a matter of fact, the negotiators at Bretton did not want to call it a bank but could think of no other word. A bank, as you know, is a place where people deposit their money, which is taken by the banker and loaned to bring a profit to the institution. Any comparison of that formula to what was set up at Bretton is humorous if not ironical.

"Certain general standards for the loans were fixed, but these were the easiest possible standards naturally. They were not the standards of banks for commercial loans."

The Duke of Bedford, one of England's leading monetary authorities says of Bretton Woods:

"It is a most impudent attempt by the worst type of Wall Street financiers to secure financial domination of the world…. The financiers who hatched this scheme suggested the establishment of a gang of their own representatives who would be above every government of the world, including our own."

Under the plot the [International Monetary] Fund and The [World] Bank alone have the power to terminate their own existence or to amend their constitutions. Should any international organization be set up to control world affairs, the only obligation imposed upon the bank and the fund is to "co-operate" with such organization, the terms of such organization being entirely at their own discretion. Any future World Authority will thus wait meekly, cap in hand, to learn the good pleasures of the Masters of the Purse. Such are the budding fruits of a war fought in the name of democracy,

but in reality to make any repetition of the democratic German money experiment, there or elsewhere, impossible.

In these international constitutions national sovereign nations become mere doormats on which the money power will wipe its boots.

The World Bank plan stipulates that:

> *"The property and assets of the Fund wherever located and by whomever held, shall be immune from search, confiscation, expropriation or any other or legislative action."*

The Fund's archives are inviolable. Its operations are to be "free from restrictions, regulation, control or moratoria of any nature." Immunities from interference are also bestowed upon its communications, and on its resident and travelling staffs.

The Fund, its assets, property, income, and its numerous operations and transactions are furthermore immune from taxation of any kind by any government. Similar immunities apply to the International Bank, except that it will allow itself to be sued under certain conditions it lays down.

This imposing list of immunities covers any eventuality quite effectively. No abrogation is tolerated even in time of war. The personnel of these institutions will have the privilege of passing freely from warring nations on one side to those on the other side. They can correspond freely with the enemy without censorship, do business with him, advance him money, and ship him bullion or currency under safe conduct, just as international finance has always tried to do—too often with success, a success that is assured any. where in the world now.

From one end of the articles to the other there is not a word to be found limiting the power of the institution in time of

war to do “business as usual” with both sides They could even prescribe neutrality if such would happen to serve their purposes better. America has a minority vote in any combination, and once she stops being Santa Claus for the rest of the world at the expense of the tax paying public she will find her financial arrangements helpless in advance because of the commitments granted in the framework of this financial tyrant.

Bretton Woods gives International High Finance the green light to proceed with its planned domination of the world, to create economic conditions beneficial for the maintenance of the profit rate and not for the people. It is definitely the deliverance of the world to Mammon. It is self evident why not a word of this plot was made known to an anxious and interested nation.

“Freedom and Plenty,” the news organ of the Neo-Economy movement which, like money reform movements everywhere, protested against the tragedy of Bretton Woods gives its official and pointed view in part as follows:

“The representatives of international High Finance, assembled at Bretton Woods to provide the future of exploitation on an international and uniform scale, clothed their final draft of the experts’ plan of the new gold standard in such tangled, tricky, technical clauses that the victimized people of the world will never recognize that the dollar and the pound sterling are linked with gold and that the disastrous gold standard has, within the life of the present generation, been imposed on them the second time….

“The complicated wording of the final Bretton Woods document will make it possible to convince the Members of Congress in U.S.A. that we actually got the gold standard back, and the Members of Parliament in England that they did not get the gold standard back….

“Under the plan it will become impossible for this country or other countries to withdraw from the Fund and thus escape the consequences of our folly to have accepted the plan. Under Article XI the board of international financiers is given power to declare economic war on the United States should she devalue the dollar against the Board’s wishes. Further, all the United Nations will have to undertake to boycott this country in such an event.

“To give the international bankers the control over the world, so that they can exploit the nations of the world systematically, is one of the most sinister plans ever hatched by our administration. It will not only mean loss of our economic and political sovereignty, not only involve economic contraction with mass poverty, but also new friction, and the necessity of fighting new wars, with the secret powers behind people’s governments pulling the wires as desired by them.”

A close look at the press will show that Wall Street has now been lengthened to run through Bretton Woods. No stranger union outside the odd bedfellows of politics has ever been seen. In the internationalists’ propaganda Bretton Woods was the term used to designate the great financial scheme which would remake the postwar world into Utopia. New Deal publicists of all types were used to sell the scheme to the public. As part of their tactics, they smeared U.S. bankers.

Now the World Bank, as it is called, has started operations. Heading it are not New Dealers but a Wall Street lawyer and a Wall Street banker. Even the organization named to handle its public relations is of Wall Street.

Members of Congress regard Thomas W. Lamont, chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan and company, as the most powerful figure in New York financial circles. His position is being challenged somewhat by Winthrop Aldrich, head of the Chase National Bank, but the latter has far to go before he fills the Lamont shoes. It was Aldrich who proposed making an

outright gift of the 3 3/4 billion dollar grant to Britain.

Morgan and company is considered the dominant voice in Wall Street. Other potent voices in addition to the Chase National Bank are such international bankers as Lazard Freres, Lehman Brothers, and Kuhn Loeb and Company.

In the early days of the New Deal, Wall streeters were reputedly on the outs with the administration. President Roosevelt had called for driving the money changers out of the temple. Nevertheless, J. P. Morgan himself was invited to the White House at least once for private consultation with the President. In 1937 when the New Deal was face to face with a business recession President Roosevelt began summoning business leaders quietly and even publicly to the White House. From the fall of 1937 Wall streeters were accustomed to having the door of the White House opened to them.

Lamont began as a White House visitor at that time. Owen D. Young and a host of leading business leaders paraded down Pennsylvania avenue to the nation’s most famous address. At the same time British titles began appearing in increasing numbers on the calling list at the executive mansion.

At this time President Roosevelt shifted his attention from the domestic to the international scene. He was persuaded that domestic recovery could come through international stabilization instead of international stabilization through domestic recovery.

Within a year Wall streeters began crowding into the New Deal. Representatives of financial interests and their law firms began easing out planners of the new economy.

President Truman evidently gained many votes by charging that the Republican Party was controlled by Wall Street. His blast is true, but it is only half of the story. Wall Street also controls the Democratic Party with its synthetic liberals, foreign policy chameleons and America Last cultists which have

positions of leadership in both parties. These leaders form the vanguard of State Socialism in America. The depression they will bring must be followed by an America First uprising that will stop the palming off of America's fortunes to foreign deadbeat nations, stop the playing of a shell game with America's economy, and establish in its place an American policy in finance and elsewhere if America is to have security—or even survival.

By 1940 Wall street, which had "opposed" Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, was working for the third term. Roosevelt and Wall street have been widely credited with formulating the strategy that won Wendell Willkie, a former Socialist and a former Democrat, the Republican nomination.

Willkie was known to Wall street as much of an interventionalist as the President was, even at the time the barefoot boy of Wall street was denouncing war in his campaign. At a dinner given by Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Reid of the internationalist New York Herald Tribune on June 4, 1940, Thomas Lamont was invited to look over two Republican Presidential possibilities—Willkie and Senator Taft. The guest of honor was the late Philip Kerr, British ambassador known in England as Lord Lothian.

Lewis Douglas, president of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, made a speech advocating United States entry into the war, according to a published account of the dinner. Taft differed with Douglas but Willkie indorsed his stand unqualifiedly. Three days later Willkie made an isolationist speech in Brooklyn, which ten months later he told a senate committee was merely "campaign oratory." Within the month of the dinner Willkie, an unknown, had "captured" the Republican nomination.

Douglas had been with the New Deal as budget director. Subsequently he quit in protest against New Deal fiscal policies. He returned after Roosevelt and Wall street buried the hatchet. Recently he was named ambassador to England by

President Truman, which appointment was regarded as evidence of Wall street influence on the latest occupant of the White House.

In 1944 Wall Street was preparing to help Roosevelt put over Willkie for the Republican candidate again so that the President would have another set-up campaign. Willkie's hopes were dashed by an ignominious defeat in the Wisconsin primary of that year. Wall streeters then turned to Governor Dewey of New York whom they had wooed from nationalist to internationalist ranks. To keep Dewey in line with their one-world program, they reportedly had secured a commitment from him to name John Foster Dulles, partner in a leading Wall Street law firm, secretary of state.

In 1948 with a once-defeated Dewey definitely in their camp these interests openly supported "One World" Stassen, one of the earliest advocates of the junking of our own Constitution and Declaration of Independence in favor of "world government," while he was apparently popular. As his chances of victory waned they set up other stooges in strategic positions to assure themselves a suitable mouthpiece, not the least of whom was Michigan's vascillating, oscillating, tittillating Senatorial jumping jack and political grasshopper, Arthur Vandenberg.

The McBride report published a bit of information as startling as it is enlightening when it reported:

"Anticipating a Republican victory in the 1948 Presidential election, Wall Street bankers of one-world persuasion are grooming several prominently mentioned men for the Republican nomination, one of whom they hope to nominate at Philadelphia. Two of these have endorsed reciprocal trade which is just another name for free trade, while others are exhibiting very decided one-world tendencies. Wall Street internationalists have been able to get away with this before, so it behooves the American people to be on guard, lest they lose when they

think they are winning.

“Most people on Capitol Hill know the above facts, but because a myth has been built up that no one can be nominated or elected President of the United States without the approval of Wall Street, many fear to say what they are thinking. Wall Street bankers of one-world persuasion are the most vulnerable group in the United States. They are the enemies of both labor and industry, but by keeping labor and industry divided, they have been able, with the help of Communists and fellow travelers, to dominate our domestic and foreign policy.

“Real Americans, both employers and employees of the farm, mine, and factory, who believe in free competitive enterprise, sound money, and sound domestic economy, must unite against the common enemy. American public opinion, intelligently directed is more powerful than all the international banker-racketeers that ever lived.”

After the outbreak of the war Wall streeters began to dominate the government in the open instead of behind the scenes. Various top positions were given to Wall streeters. Many young Wall street lawyers and fiscal experts were introduced into less important, but nonetheless key posts.

Former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is financing one of several syndicates and industrial corporations that wish to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Venezuela because of tax advantages. Stettinius, with the Bank of America, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and other banking companies, is backing the Lynch, Wilde Company of New York and Washington.

Stettinius, a Morgan partner, virtually turned over conduct of foreign affairs to New York fiscal interests and those who profit in foreign trade. His influence still holds in the department.

The former undersecretary of state for foreign affairs was

William L. Clayton who, with his family, owns 40 percent of the stock of Anderson Clayton Company, largest cotton dealers in America. He has close ties with New York banks and Britain Secretary of State Acheson, corporation lawyer and newcomer to diplomacy, is a leader in formulation of the one-world program.

Dean Acheson, who as undersecretary of State has in many respects been the de-facto head of the department under both Secretaries Marshall and Byrnes, quit his job. He was to rejoin the law firm which is said to be handling at least one of the applications for inter national loans that he has been promoting in the state department. His successor is Robert A. Lovett.

Lovett's appointment will mean the addition of another Wall street representative to the high ranking officials of the Truman administration. The list includes Commerce Secretary Harriman, Navy Secretary Forrestal, War Secretary Patterson, William L. Clayton, one-time undersecretary of state for economic affairs; John Brown, assistant navy secretary; Howard Petersen, assistant war secretary, and Lewis Douglas, ambassador to Great Britain.

Robert A. Lovett, undersecretary of state, formerly a partner in the investment banking firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman and Co., says that America will have to dig into its pocket again in a hurry to keep Europe going. The Lovett plan for "emergency" aid is quite apart from the proposed Marshall plan which would siphon out the heavy cash on a long term basis.

The New Deal and the ranks of the state department in particular are not lacking in advocates of all sorts of schemes to bundle off America's billions abroad. One of the remarkable aspects of the situation is how much of this clamor is coming from men Wall street has planted in the administration.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman, for example, was a senior member of the same investment banking house as Lovett. Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Undersecretary of War Draper were, respectively president and vice president of another Wall street firm of investment bankers, Dillon, Read and Co. Assistant Secretary of State Saltzman was vice president of the New York Stock exchange. More could be named.

Lovett's connections certainly do not commend him as trustworthy to commit the nation to further enormous diversions of the taxpayers' dollars for the benefit of Europe. He lives in the crowd that profits by these transactions, for Wall street not only has investments to protect abroad, but it has fat rake-offs, commissions, and profits to be had when these billions are spent in the American market.

Secretary off War Patterson was a Wall street lawyer before he went to the federal bench, from which he was brought into the sub-cabinet by Secretary Stimson, still another Wall street lawyer. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder ranks as one of the elite, certainly not because he is from St. Louis, but because he is an international banker. The only qualification necessary is that he belong to this fraternity: It then matters not whether he be from Padukah, the Kremlin, Mars, Anarctica, or Bali Bali.

This is probably the greatest concentration of spokesmen for Wall street and its international high-binding that has ever been assembled in any American cabinet. It is particularly striking that this concentration should occur in an administration that' started out 14 years ago with the announced watchword of driving the money changers out of the temple and so lately smear U.S. bankers of the internationalistic clan.

Secretary Forrestal could very easily have found many other highly eligible candidates for the post of general counsel of

the navy department, but is consistent with his outlook that he should have awarded the job to a British born lawyer. In view of the fashionable disposition of Forrestal and his fellow Wall streeters to regard the United States as dedicated to the preservation of the empire, it probably seemed logical that if he could not install a full blown Britisher in the job, he should settle for the next best thing.

The British have been lavish in bestowing their decorations and knightly orders upon American admirals. The same sort of flattery has been successful in dealing with army, and the state department these days is little more than a branch of the British foreign office. Representative Eaton, presiding over the house committee of foreign affairs, is a native Canadian, and Mr. Vandenberg, his opposite number in the Senate, is by conviction a devoted servant, even if denied the advantages of birth within the empire.

Senator Vandenberg, Money Power's favorite on, testified recently before the Senate Committee on the Greek loan. When asked why the loan was not handled by the World Bank he replied:

"It is definitely anticipated that the World Bank will step into this situation and carry the major rehabilitation load just as soon as the imminent crisis is surmounted; just as soon as peace and preliminary stability are restored; just as soon as there is any basis whatever for banking credit."

In other words, as soon as Greece is a good risk for private bankers! Until then the U.S. Government can have it and tax the public to pay for it!

Eastern banking interests are active participants in Bretton Woods because it offers a profitable field of international money lending. Under the program of the government's export-import bank, private commercial banks lend money to foreign borrowers but the loans are guaranteed by the export-import

bank in that the commercial institutions are reimbursed for their loans in full upon demand.

Thus although the private banks may profit from the foreign loans, the federal government actually bears the obligation and risk. Extending Wall Street from Washington through Bretton Woods was an event of self-evident design and is so well established that only such stooges as Roosevelt and Truman would say as Truman did say in his last Jefferson-Jackson Day speech that: “The Democratic Party has taken the Government from Wall Street and given it back to Washington.”

United States Ambassador Lewis Douglas said in a speech at a luncheon given in his honor in Denbay, England; that the United States and Britain are “in the same pot together. We have to remain in the same pot together—for if either of us falls out we fall into the fire together.”

Why are the United States and Britain in the fire together? Not because Britain is the source of our raw materials. Not because Britain is the source of our technical brains. Not because Britain has all the ships, trains, and airplanes. Not because Britain has any monopoly on scientific advancement. Not because Britain is the source of our food. Not because Britain has the Atom bomb while America hasn’t. Certainly not because Britain loans America money on which to operate.

America and Britain are “in the same pot together” because international bankers find it to their profit to hang on to the Empire’s sources of plunder, and this they will do even if America must be placed in the same grave with the now dead Empire. The revolt of the 13 colonies for independence, freedom and democracy has been successfully reversed. With the internationalists in charge the United States is to its own serious detriment back under the crown in all but the name of a colony.

So complete is the control of international finance in the

post-war world … that starving Germany is compelled to export biscuits to starving England which in turn is compelled by the usury lords to export biscuits all over the world. So everybody starves to keep King Export on the throne. All starving countries have a Ministry of Food to keep them hungry. The rule of Money Power, Planned Hunger and Ministers of Food are all parts of the same set-up. God has not failed. The world is bursting with food. Hungry people cannot get at the food for two hellish reasons: first, the Money Power sees to it they are kept short on money; second, the producers are taxed, controlled, restricted, and regimented so the food cannot move but must rot.

Thus can be seen what is happening to European countries. It can be imagined who the angels are who are so kindly placing mortgages on those countries and issuing them paper on their own collateral. These people can hardly be expected to show their appreciation by erecting a monumental to the kind international bankers who make them furnish the dough, bake the cake, and then pay the bankers in order to eat their own cake. Modern civilization has become a debt-culture in which the present generation pays the debts of a former generation by issuing bonds for the next generation to pay.

Until the principles of sound finance are established the World Enemy of International Finance will fatten as any leech which sucks the blood of others. It is therefore not surprising to find that the new president of Italy was president of the Bank of Italy who is “most friendly to the United States” and who thinks that U.S. gifts are “the key to recovery.”

These national and international enemies with their UN-Bretton Woods philosophy have reached the ultimate in Secretary Marshall’s perfidious Wall street scheme to internationalize America’s wealth for the benefit of other “isms” at the expense and perhaps the death of Americanism. There will always be an America only if we can keep such floundering

hirelings from giving her away. The world was told that the gift loan to Britain was to "put Britain back on her feet." It did not put Britain back on her feet and was not intended to put her back on her feet. The Marshall plan for the "recovery of Europe" will not bring recovery to Europe and is not intended to bring recovery to Europe no matter when the bleeding hearts, globalists and their shouting internationalists say. These schemes are for the exclusive profits of International potentates of purse and putrifaction. Our federal reserve printing presses are to furnish money for the world, our crops to feed it, our fleets to patrol it, our troops to get shoved around everywhere in it, and our statesmanship to play with it all under the expert direction of banker specialists in foreign med. cling.

The McBride Report printed for the use of the Committee of Coinage, Weights and Measures, of the House of Representatives, wisely observes:

> *"Every war since the wars of the Crusades has been, in essence, an economic war. Every major depression which has afflicted the United States and the world in the past seventy five years has been the inevitable result of an unsound world economy and an unsound monetary system. If we would end wars and depressions, we must first ascertain and then eliminate the causes.*
>
> *"Sound money and a sound world economy are absolutely essential to the survival of free enterprise and constitutional government."*
>
> *The perfected set-up of international finance is the Number One Enemy of every reader of this book. Much will be accomplished if this book is instrumental in informing the people who and what their enemy is and what should be done about it. To know the enemy is the primary essential. The next is to know the remedy which is monetary reform based upon Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5 of the Constitution of*

the United States of America. Americans owe to America in general, and to themselves in particular, to acquaint themselves with organizations advocating constitutional money. The forces against the imperative reformation are great, but the power of an aroused America is greater. Unless we reform money here and show all other nations how money should be reformed we shall have no peace on earth. Without monetary reform there is no use to talk of any other national or international, social, political or economic reform. The money problem is the basic problem of simple justice. It is the key to most economic problems, and the peace of World War II will be lost, as was the peace of World War I, without the establishment of this foundation for Justice, Peace and Freedom.

"Money is the mysterious power, the Goddess that gives birth to civilization but that also can destroy civilization.

"The purification of money must be added to our expiation for the blood that has been spilled. It is not the heartless science of economics which requires this: It's truth, right and loyalty."