

THE FIRST BANKERS' WAR 1914-1919

PREFACE

Since 1945 a rigid academic orthodoxy has insisted on only one viable method of assessing and analysing world events of the twentieth century. That method gave the illusion of scientific discourse since it posited two opposing viewpoints, permitting a debate between them to pass for valid evaluation. Thus a narrow dialectic of 'left and right', or capitalist and communist, was considered the only permissible frame for apprehending the awesome and radical changes that devastated Europe throughout the century. One inescapable irony of this highly irrational situation was that it insisted in advance that the 'left' viewpoint was the only one within which models for the future could be formed. In other words, there was a crude oppositional frame opposing 'right-wing' doctrines, by definition fascist and thus anti-humanist and unacceptable, to left-wing and thus humanist, acceptable forces. The illusion of discourse was then preserved within the new frame of dialectical tension between radical, and by implication communist, policies and reticent and vulnerable socialist ideals.

Since any attempt to reject the dominant and rigid structuralism that had been built on the ruins of a war-torn Europe was inevitably labelled fascist, and thus abhorrent, it guaranteed that, whatever the social programme intended by the dominant political hegemony was, it would never face any physical manifestation of resistance.

All this has changed. Since the so-called 'cold-war' has given way to open policies, and since the internal order of the Russian empire has begun to disintegrate, two things have emerged.

1) The clear evidence that the peoples of the Russian empire, including the Russians themselves, considered communism a vicious and imposed tyranny. This in turn, offered an

unanswerable challenge to all those radicals who had mysteriously been created in the universities by capitalist governments since 1950. In short - why were they leading Western Europe to the system which had so patently failed in the East?

2) The mythical difference between the two world systems and their enmity became a dubious proposition. The financial linkage between the two major capitalist powers and the East indicated that there was one underlying and harmonic structure being resolved and redefined. The apparent conflict in Poland is an open example of this. The American assassination of a Pope to put a Pole in the Vatican and through him to design a national 'trade- union' to replace the former communist structure and thus assure the necessary payments owed by Poland to the Banks could be interpreted as the harmonic resolution of opposing themes within one symphonic frame.

This touches on the subject of the document before us. What has begun to happen for the first time since the fateful year 1945 has been a new assessment of the century in the light of current changes. When Ernst Nolte's monumental study *The European Civil War 1917-1945* appeared everything changed. What was significant about this work was that it used a methodology quite outside the 'critical dialectic insisted upon by the rabbis of the Frankfurt School which had risen to power after 1950 and taken power in 1968. His interpretation of the events within these two fateful dates of European History had enormous impact on our historical understanding. The hysterical and slanderous attacks, culminating in a bomb outrage against his life and property, indicated that his analysis and method had hit the mark. When the dust, both of bomb and insult, had cleared, what could be seen was a severe classical study of events mirroring directly the method of our civilisation's first systematic

historian, Thucydides. For, just as Thucydides had failed to make sense of the two, great wars that 'had destroyed Greece when he viewed them as two separate phenomena and then had seen a significant and meaningful pattern to events when he viewed the two wars as one, so Nolte had grasped that the historical events from 1917 to 1945 represented one continuous struggle between two forces, National Socialism and Bolshevism, or if you like National Socialism and International Socialism. Thus, the victory of 1945 was nothing other than the victory, not just of Russia, but of International Socialism. In the light of his book it began to be clear why history ceased to be taught after the 39-45 War and in its place was put sociology, and why apparently 'capitalist' regimes installed militant marxists in the western university system: men like Adorno, Marcuse, Meyer, Habermas, the list is long, the common factors inescapable: jewish, marxist and structuralist. This assured that all academic discourse would be within a fundamental acceptance of socialism, which itself represents the essential model for a controlled society so essential to the functioning of the 'free radical' which is oligarchic monetarism. The Weber-Marx- Habermas orthodoxy is specifically designed to continue a critical debate which never permits critique of the financial system which sustains the debate, and indeed pays Habermas' salary. The silence of the Frankfurt school on the subject of the genocide and torture of the Palestinians is matched by the silence on the iniquity of interest-banking. If we are to talk of the silence of Heidegger in the thirties are we not also to demand explanation for the silence of Buber, Levinas and Marcuse etc. over the effects of the bank's extortion policies which cause the death of millions of children in Africa and South America and over the role of Israeli colonial slaughter and its racist exploitation in the 'homelands' of South Africa?

Just as Nolte and other German historians opened up the thinking about events for the first time, so also it became possible to make other models which took into account the profound observation of another silenced writer, Ernst Jiinger, who noted in *Strathlungen* that when the German nation lost the war all nations lost. What he meant was that the political reality of the nation-state had once and for all disappeared. It is not an accident or an anomaly that the collapse of the East is being expressed by natural state organisms calling for freedom, for is that not what is happening in the West - Ireland, the Basque Country, Corsica, Scotland, Tyrol, and so on?

What the Nolte book created is a new insight into another historical model, one which allows us to measure not just the continental shift of state crises, which we now recognise to be irrelevant, but rather one in which as the national states vanish before the super-state structures of market-communities there emerge the new power structures of internationalism, utterly liberated from land-based elements, the new interlinked forces of world banking and brokerage. At last we can identify and measure the unelected oligarchy of banking and brokerage which has enslaved the whole world's population so that today every child born comes into the world a debtor, and a debtor to a group of men whose names his parents do not even know.

The text which follows outlines the Bankers' War which enthroned the bankers in power following their long struggle since 1789, when they first emerged as significant and capable of control. The Second War, which Nolte analysed, saw the successful | establishment of new 'democratic' states whose function was nothing less than the ordering of the masses to guarantee their willing indebtedness while socially organised under varying socialist models

that harmonised with monetarism. The success of this venture, which lasted from 1945-1968, culminated in the victory of 1969 which heralded the beginning of absolute power in the hands of the monetarist forces and the evolution of a new indebted society, openly and frankly heading for One World Government under the control of a unified usurious market enslaving the whole world population in a mythic world state democracy while the banking and monetarist elite remained unknown, shadowy and unelected by any franchise. Thus, economics has become the system of power, and politics has been reduced to a service industry.

Shaykh ‘Abdalqadir al-Murabit

THE BANKERS' WAR

Although it is one of the best kept secrets of the war of 1914-1918, the British Empire's Treasury was already bankrupt when Great Britain declared war on the German Reich, manifestly to honour its treaty with invaded Belgium. If we examine the reality of the financial relations between the main parties who entered into war, we discover an extraordinary background of secret credits, of schemes to share the raw materials and the natural wealth of the whole world of that time on the basis of credit through stocks. New York was to be the banker of the enterprise.

According to popular history books it was a Serbian assassin, Gavrilo Princip, who started the hostilities by killing at Sarajevo on 28 June 1914 the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Ferdinand, and his wife Sophie. After a month of frantic negotiations Austria declared war on the small state of Serbia on 28 July, holding it responsible for the murder of the Archduke. Austria had been assured of Germany's support in the event of Russia supporting Serbia. The next day, 29 July, Russia ordered its armies to mobilise in preparation for war. Then, on the same day, the Czar cancelled his order on receiving a telegram from the German Kaiser begging him not to mobilise his army. On the 3 July the Russian High Command persuaded the weak Czar to resume the mobilisation. On 31 July the German Ambassador in St Petersburg submitted to the Czar a declaration of war, burst into tears, and rushed out of the room. FINANCIAL CRISIS OR TREATY CRISIS?

On 3 August 1914, Germany declared war on France and the German armies invaded Belgium to attack France from the north. On 4 August, only one week after Austria had declared war on Serbia, England declared war on Germany, invoking its commitment to

protect Belgium's neutrality. The folly of the next four years, the massacre of a generation and the destruction of Europe are not our concern. What we must understand is why Britain declared war on 4 August 1914.

The British decision to enter into war in order to defend its Belgian neighbour on the continent was remarkable in view of the fact that the British treasury and pound sterling system was virtually bankrupt. It is even more amazing in the light of the series of internal memoranda by the British treasury under Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lloyd George, which have recently been de-classified. In January 1914, six months before the *causus belli* of Sarajevo, the Chancellor had asked Sir George Paish, a high official of the Treasury, to conduct a thorough investigation into the state of Britain's gold reserves. Since the 1870s, the pound sterling and the City of London had represented the pivot of the world's financial and monetary system, in the same way that New York and the dollar have represented it since 1945 under the Bretton Woods agreement.

The confidential memorandum of Sir George reveals the official opinion in London at the time. One reads: "Another influence which favours banking reform is the growing commercial and | banking power of Germany and our increasing concern that the gold reserves of London would be ransacked before or at the start ,of a great conflict between the two countries." In his report Sir George Paish spoke about the progressive sophistication of the big German commercial banks since the Balkan Crisis of 1911-1912 which had led them to increase their gold reserves substantially. Paish warned that any sudden withdrawal of funds from outside London "could seriously impede the nation's capability to collect the necessary money to conduct a great war." This was six months before Sarajevo.

On 22 May 1914, another high official of the British Treasury, Basil Blackett, wrote a confidential memorandum to Lloyd George on the subject of “the effect of war on our gold reserves” which is equally revealing. “It is certainly impossible clearly to foresee the effects of a general European war in which most of the continental countries as well as Great Britain would be engaged and where only New York of all the big monetary markets of the world (supposing the United States remain neutral) could still provide gold from outside the war.” Yet another letter is amazing in the light of the English decision to go to war on 4 August. It is a letter from Sir George Paish to Lloyd George, dated Saturday 1 August 1914, 2.00 am, which stated: “The credit system on which the business of this country is based has collapsed completely and it is of the utmost important that measures should be taken to repair the damage without delay ... evidently we cannot hope to finance a great war if from the start our big financial houses are reduced to bankruptcy ...” Payments in hard cash (gold and money) were suspended along with the Banking Act of 1844 thus putting at the Bank of England's disposal a huge quantity of gold to face the payments for food and military materiel.

THE FALL OF THE POUND STERLING

The foundations of British domination established after 1815 were to place enormous strain on the pound over the next fifty years. In the years after 1850, Great Britain had emerged as the first industrial power in the world, its iron smelting was a model and its fleet unequalled.

However, after the panic of 1857, the British elite started systematically to pillage its own industrial economy as well as that of the rest of the world. After 1857 the official policy

adopted by the Bank of England consisted of a series of procedures which regulated the world's gold reserves, based at the time in London, by raising or lowering the Bank's interest rates, and this in preference to treating the root causes of domestic technological stagnation. So it was that, whenever gold left England and endangered the credit reserves of the country, the Bank of England would react by raising its bank rate. Gold would then start to flow into London from other centres such as New York or Paris. Of course, investment in national industry was ruined and industrial farming was in jeopardy, right up to the end of the 1880s. Great Britain attempted to compensate for this devastation by bleeding the colonies, especially India, through controlling the terms of exchange to the financial advantage of the City of London. Famine, industrial depression and similar consequences throughout the world were 'external problems' from the point of view of those circles which forged the politics of the Bank of England, that is to say the important international banking families of London like the Barings, the Rothschilds and the Hambros. But from the end of the century up to 1914 these manipulations became increasingly inadequate to the situation.

It needed several years for the consequences of the 1857 change to make itself fully felt. From 1880, on British industry had been completely surpassed in its rate of technological development by the industrial growth throughout the rest of the world. Two countries emerged as the new leaders of the technological world, the USA and Germany.

In the 1870s, partly due to the influence of the prior economic reforms of Friedrich List, Germany had started to build its own independent banking structure in order to liberate its external trade from the London financiers. Germany responded to the industry, agriculture, government and banking, it was representative of all the economic interest groups in the

nation. It resulted in strict laws being imposed on other industrial nations, limiting and prohibiting trade on terms and other forms of stock speculation. Credit was oriented towards investment in agriculture and industry and the German fleet was rapidly developed in order to give the country greater control over its own trade, breaking the British monopoly of merchant shipping. As a result the superior quality of German machines began to penetrate the English and American markets.

The world domination by the British Empire became threatened. Yet still the British establishment refused to face the evidence of what fifty years of disinvestment had done to industrial policy. Instead, it prepared itself for war in order to reorganise the world's economic situation. Instead of modernising British industry, the country's leaders turned towards its friends in the international banking community of New York to ask for 'a very big loan'.

THE HOUSE OF MORGAN

London soon played its card. Its most important investment market since 1879 had been the United States. In October 1914 the British Minister of War sent a representative to neutral America to arrange purchases and other materials. In January 1915, four months after the beginning of the Great War, the British Government appointed a private New York banking house, Morgan and Co, its exclusive commissary contracting party for all military purchases in America. Morgan House then became Great Britain's sole financing agent. London also became the security for all the purchases made by the Russians, Italians and French in the United States. The whole of this tremendous burden had a devastating effect on British finance, and the role of the House of Morgan and the financial community of

New York began to change from that of passive investment to governing authority in exercise of its fiduciary contract.

The purchase of all arms, munitions, grain and other products was therefore co-ordinated by the Morgan private bank through the intermediary of its London subsidiary, Morgan Grenfell and Co, whose partner, E.C. Grenfell, was the director of the Bank of England and a close friend of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lloyd George. The Paris branch of Morgan, Morgan Harjes Cie, closed this vital circle of international finance. Morgan, the monetary contracting party of the Alliance, became the arbitrator who decided which American firms would obtain war contracts to supply the main European countries in the war against Germany. Some companies like Du Pont Chemicals were transformed into giants during this period. The rifle manufacturers, Remington and Winchester, were favoured by Morgan. Huge cereal trading companies were created in the Midwest to feed Morgan's European clients. This bank found itself in an unprecedented position, all the more so because the American President, Woodrow Wilson, at the time professed strict neutrality. This neutrality was purely verbal since millions of dollars, military equipment and food credits were destined to go to Britain during the coming years. Only by virtue of being the commissary contracting party, Morgan took 2% commission on the nett price of all shipped goods. E.R. Stattinias, who afterwards became Secretary of State, was made a partner of Morgan in order to become chief contracting agent in the colossal operation.

All this, of course, was a flagrant violation of international law in relation to neutrality, according to which belligerents did not have the right to establish supply bases in a neutral country. At one moment the Morgan Bank was the subject of a sensational enquiry in which

it was accused of preferentially ordering purchases from firms linked to its own partners. From 1917 the British Minister of War gave orders through the intermediary of Morgan House for purchases amounting to over 2 billion dollars. This amount does not include the direct loans from Morgan and the circle of New York financiers contracted by Great Britain, France, etc.

In 1915, the Secretary of the Treasury, McAdoo, convinced President Wilson, who had become anxious, that such private loans were necessary to maintain American exports. Between 1913 and 1915 American exports to Great Britain grew by 68%. On the eve of the United States' entry into the war in 1917, the Entente Powers had obtained 1.25 billion dollars, thanks to the private efforts of Morgan, Citibank, and the other big New York Houses which controlled the Federal Reserve Bank in New York.

In January 1917, at a time when Russia was ready to succumb to total impoverishment, when France was on the edge of bankruptcy, and when the pound sterling was merely hanging by a thread, Morgan and the financing community of New York, with the help of British Intelligence, seeing that there was no other way to recover their investment, made the moves that would bring American intervention in the European War against Germany. Morgan and Great Britain would otherwise have been faced with total financial ruin at the beginning of 1917. General Ludendorff's declaration of total submarine war gave the necessary excuse and 'Isolation' was over. .

WAR AS MONEY

Once the United States had declared war on Germany on 2 April 1917, the financial community of New York with the vital support of the Governor of the New York Federal

Reserve Bank, Benjamin Strong, launched the most ambitious financing operation in human history. If on 23 December 1913 President Wilson had not given the force of law to the Federal Reserve System on Morgan's insistence, one could seriously ask whether the United States would ever have engaged itself in the European war as it did, or maybe even if the British would have had the audacity to blame the continental empires in August 1914.

From 1917 onwards the Federal Reserve organised the loans and Liberty Bonds needed to finance the military costs of the American Treasury. American Treasury Bonds sold through the New York investment services of Morgan, etc. amounted to more than 21.478 billion dollars on 30th June 1919. Morgan continued to take its commissions.

In 1920, Morgan's partner, Thomas W. Lamont, declared himself satisfied that, consequent to four years of war, "the national debts of the world had grown to 210 billion dollars being a 475% increase over a period of six years and this the variety of government bonds and the number of investors have greatly multiplied. These results have become manifest throughout the world on all its investment markets but maybe more in the United States than anywhere else." Within that framework of war and its new economy the national debt of Great Britain in 1919 stood at around 120 billion dollars.

One could say, using the terminology of Hugo Grotius which defined wars as just and unjust, that not one of the governments of the principal belligerents of 1914 could claim justice. Each held the other responsible for the war and each pursued a form of imperial objectives. Yet if this was the state of affairs at the outbreak and during the execution of the vast slaughter, the terms that the victors imposed on the defeated empires, especially

Germany, exceeded these in its gross injustice. England, as well as the continental European powers, were in ruins after five years of havoc but Wall Street and Morgan did not hesitate one moment to make the best of the opportunity.

Morgan's men, notably Lamont and a Morgan man on Wall Street, Bernard Baruch, sat at the table of the very important committee of the Versailles Congress on War Reparations, with the intention of "presenting the bill" for the war. This they did. A permanent mission for war reparations was established to calculate the exact amount for which the devastated Germany of 1919 would be invoiced. In 1922, a young Wall Street lawyer who participated in the 'Versailles negotiations, John Foster Dulles, explained the position of the Morgan House in the new Morgan revue Foreign Affairs. It was brutally simplistic. "There cannot be war without losses. Losses are measured by debts. Debt comes in many forms - internal, reparations, inter-allied, etc. and is constituted generally of bonds and shares." Dulles calculated that England, France and their allies were owed 12.5 billion dollars at a 5% interest rate. On the other hand, the War Reparations Commission of Versailles determined that Germany owed the Allies the sum of 33 billion dollars. Morgan and the international consortium of bankers in New York demanded adamantly that those amounts should be paid up to the last cent.

THE BANKS TAKE POWER

The double burden of reparations owed by Germany and the inter- allied debts owed by the so-called 'victors', meaning the debts of France, Italy, Belgium, etc. owed to England and the United States, and what England itself owed to the United States, dominated all financial and monetary policies from 1919 until the Wall Street crash of 1929. The annual service of

war debts represented more than the United States' total foreign trade in the twenties. With the support of Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, and of Benjamin Strong, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the Morgan private international banking group controlled those vast transfers of capital and organised the repayments of this confusing, but to them so immensely profitable debt burden.

The result of this enormous movement of wealth and palpitation of credit, divorced from real commercial activity, brought an inevitable stagnation in international trade. This malaise dominated the twenties. In 1928 the New York Council of Foreign Trade calculated that international commercial exchange reached only 25 million dollars, that is in fixed 1913 dollars. It was half of what it would have been if the war and the Versailles debt mechanism had not stunted commercial growth. In 1920 the volume of international commerce represented approximately half of that of 1902! It is therefore hardly astonishing that this collapse of international commerce resulted in a gravely depressed situation such as had never been seen before.

In November 1923, the matter of collecting debts according to Versailles was, for the first time, being arranged to the satisfaction of the international banks. Subsequent to the French military occupation of the coal mines and iron smelting installations along the Ruhr, and the enormous devaluation of the German mark which followed this in 1923, the independent bankers decided once more to reorganise the situation. They denied governments further control over these affairs and handed over the whole matter of debt policy to central and private bankers - in other words to a triumvirate: Morgan, Benjamin Strong of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and his intimate friend Montagu Norman of the Bank of

England. One often forgets that the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the Bank of England, like the former Bank of France, were private banks and that it was their proprietor/patrons who made the vital decisions that defined the Twenties - that decade which started with a Depression, was followed by two Recessions and ended with a Crash in 1929.

This situation - which could have been avoided - was directly determined by that small group of Montagu Norman, Strong and their circle of private interest bankers in London and New York linked to Morgan and Rockefeller. With the powerful support of these two enormous powers, the Federal Reserve and the Bank of England, the Morgan syndicate started in the twenties to make itself master of entire nations, controlling them as they had once controlled mere railway companies. Power had passed from the political sphere and its institutions to the economic sphere and its banking and brokerage institutions. The modern age had begun.

THE DAWES PLAN - another evolutionary step

With the Dawes Plan in 1924, Morgan succeeded in taking the Versailles reparations completely out of government hands. At some 40% more profitable interest rates, hundreds of millions of dollars in private bank loans flowed to Germany from American markets between 1924 and 1928. A close friend of Montagu Norman, the President of the Reichsbank, Hjalmar Schacht, ensured that the procedure functioned as planned. With this situation even American exports stagnated throughout the twenties, remaining practically unchanged between 1922 and 1928. In 1920, Strong started preparing the country for the brutal credit policy that was to come. The Federal Reserve deliberately retightened credit

and contracted the monetary tender to unleash a depression in 1920-1921. In those two years American exports, notably to war-torn Europe, collapsed by 50%, slumping from 8 billion dollars to some 4 billion dollars at which level it remained until 1929. The crash in prices and exportation hit the American farmers. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York used the crisis to force thousands of regional private banks to join its system which enabled it to reinforce itself in preparation for the next phase, the application of reparation funds to new investment. It is from the mid-twenties that the predisposition of the international bankers to apply draconian social programmes or 'solutions' to gain their ends began to demonstrate that the interest of world banking could not be considered as a basis or an extension of national interest. Another power system was at work.

POST SCRIPTUM

And so it was that the inherent contradictions of interest and the unperceived shift of power from a known traditional set of social institutions to a quite unknown and shadowy set of financial institutions saw the birth of the new era. Germany, that great and potent force, unlike the exhausted 'victors', was not unable to discern it, still interpreting events in terms of national and later racial destinies. The rising up of Germany, which had been in truth the victor of the European war and only the defeated victim of a bizarre intervention by another power, 'America', led to the one last attempt to permit the successful functioning of a sovereign state, expansionist and imperial. If Nazi Germany was anything, it was a quixotic and doomed project. Quixotic because underneath its immediate success lay the romantic notion that a sovereign nation could still be the master of its fate, and doomed because it had not understood that far from being flanked by "opposing political forces - capitalist and communist, it was faced by a hegemonous monster with two faces. If Hitler had only stopped to reflect why Britain did not also declare war on Russia in 1939 when, after all, both Germany and Russia had invaded Poland, he would have grasped what became clear at Yalta to the rest of the world.

Nolte's rejection of the dialectic which posits democracy against dictatorship is of enormous importance to thinking the future. Romantic National Socialism was unscientific', and however much it borrowed from its neighbour, International Socialism, in the way of structured Year Plans, Labour Camps, extermination of political enemies, it could not be allowed to survive. Its survival chances were further aggravated by its leader's ferocious attacks on the Jews. Again, with his astonishing and frustratingly unfulfilled genius, Hitler

had perceived something vital about what was happening in Europe and then had mis-read its meaning in a proletarian error of seeing the immigrant jews as a threat to the labour market. He did understand the relation of the great jewish Houses to world finance but he failed to apply his understanding beyond a powerful and inspirational rhetoric. When his police machinery moved into autonomous action to 'solve' the problem, in one stroke it assured the jews' final victory.

The post-war orthodoxy is ruthlessly effective and for the moment no serious discourse can take place on the matter of the relationship between the international fraternity of banking jews and the previously established christian bourgeoisie. It would be wisest to go back to the greatest of the analysts of bourgeois culture, Werner Sombart, and take the discourse from that base. It is unnerving to try to talk to a German student today about his own country's past, so overpowering and successful has been the punitive and shameful brainwashing to which he has been submitted. The century cannot be understood without a frank and critical examination of the role of world jewry (their term) and its long term political goals, some of which are frankly disturbing. The outrageously unscientific term 'anti-semitic' must be examined to allow serious analysis without fear of slander and punitive silencing. Israel is a major exporter of torture technology and holds seminars on its usage. Its soldiers target the eyes of under-twelve children in the Occupied Territories, blinding them to terrorise their families into submission (there are to date 150 one-eyed Arab (semitic) children as a result of this policy). Concentration Camps are known to exist in the Negev Desert to which the International Red Cross are denied access. The Israeli Chief of Staff, General Shomron, is on record as saying (Herald Tribune, 17 June 1989), 'There

are only three ways to achieve it (the wiping out of the Intifada): transfer, starvation or physical extermination - that is, genocide.' The reporter adds, "Transfer is the Israeli term for forcible expulsion of the 1.7 million Palestinians in the occupied areas to Arab countries." Now that the Israelis have spent the vast fortune of sympathy they had won from the world, they must now face open rational examination along with others, unless they wish to claim some special superiority - which some of their ideologues are in danger of doing.

Our concern with the jews is political because their role in the new power structure of the oligarchic elite who control the banking and brokerage system is inescapable. Further, the ideology of so-called zionism is deeply disturbing to rational men and women. It is in no way a racist issue. It is a structuralist one. Underlying the current world crisis of interest-debt can be discerned a continental-shift in thinking procedures which radically puts in question the methodology that has pretended to rationalise the irrational and fantastical structures of number-wealth, allowing a handful of men to control the world's wealth by manipulative magic. In other words, banking can now be seen as a structural product of post-Kantian procedures and the Heideggerian topology identified as a new thinking intrinsically inimical to that structuralist thought and thus to the banking system.

It is here that a path of reason and deep thinking must be permitted without fear of slanderous attack or of intimidation by powerful interests who have created out of traditional judaism a "new religion to ward off any critical examination - the cult of the dead, with its holy sites, the macabre and barren landscapes of long empty concentration camps, and its Holocaust Museums costing millions of dollars, and its endless stream of fictional movies. As the last geriatric war criminal is dragged to trial to face witnesses stricken with senile

dementia, it is becoming clear that the dialectic of the fifties is over. The silence of Habermas and the Frankfurt School over the torture and degradation of the Palestinian people, which we have referred to, and the failure of their massively complex sociology, in all its brutal inelegance as a system, to point the finger at interest-debt as the active element in the destruction of forests and peoples, and to identify the financial system which emerged from the ruins of World War II Europe as being the root of all social malaise, stands alongside their silent confirmation that a politically powerless democracy is the perfect instrument to force a nation to pay its debt, now that a nation-state is nothing more than useful unit of debtors, ensuring collective guilt and responsibility to the banks for the 'national debt'. Abolish the constitutional state as today constructed and you abolish the debtor module. Abolish collective debt to non- elected financial power structures and you liberate mankind from indebted slavery and global ecological disaster. Silent on these vital issues, the Frankfurt Orthodoxy stands morally condemned and historically anachronistic. Their critical dialectic lies broken at their feet, having finally turned itself on them!

Somewhere in a remote compound on the Virgin Islands, the bankers take the sun between sessions discussing their next move after the creation of one European currency. Worried for a moment that the onward march to a One World Bank and currency might flounder, one of them looks up and asks, "What if someone were to read Plato's *Republic*?" Another smiles, "We've eliminated Greek from the curriculum. They'll never make sense of it." Another leans forward, "We can make it into a comic! The literary culture is over. Let them eat cake - or rather - let them watch video! No, books are no longer a threat...it's those Muslims in Argentina and those other ones in Tashkent that worry me. They are trading

without banks, not using our currency. It's dangerous...”